

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1953

*(Legislative day of Thursday,
May 21, 1953)*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. W. C. Fields, pastor, First Baptist Church, Yazoo City, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, our hearts are still and quiet for a moment before Thee—quiet in solemn acknowledgement of Thy sovereignty, quiet in full awareness of the presence of the thrice holy God.

Grant to Thy servants who wait before Thee here today a deep sense of humility and a continuing attitude of dependence upon divine leadership and power.

In the alternating currents and the changing patterns of this our time, this golden age of opportunity, give to all of us stability of mind, clarity of purpose, and courage for our convictions.

May the Divine Spirit so direct our lives this day that in the things we do and say, and by the very meditations of our hearts, we may conduct ourselves as good citizens of our country and the kingdom of God.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 25, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1324) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1242. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; and

H. R. 1244. An act to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes."

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills,

in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2969. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls;

H. R. 3087. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3796. An act relating to the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 4229. An act to change the name of the Polycultural Institution of America to Polycultural University of America, to grant a congressional charter to such university, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4484. An act to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses;

H. R. 4485. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to publication of partnerships;

H. R. 4486. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer;

H. R. 4487. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as further amended by an act of April 19, 1920 (title 20, ch. 1, sec. 116, D. C. Code, 1951), relating to continuing decedent's business;

H. R. 4550. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property; and

H. R. 4940. An act to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1242. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; and

H. R. 1244. An act to amend section 13 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes."

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] may be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and through June 23, in order that he may attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, to which he has been appointed a delegate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate after today, for the remainder of the week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING
SENATE SESSION

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet this afternoon and every afternoon up to and including June 15, during the sessions of the Senate. I may say that the subcommittee has a number of witnesses scheduled and is working hard to conclude its hearings by that time, but certainly we will be subject to the call of the Chair at any time important business requires our attendance in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. THYE, and by unanimous consent, the Labor and Federal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. BENNETT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXEMPTION FROM ANNUAL AND
SICK LEAVE ACT OF CERTAIN
OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTIVE
BRANCH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 4654, a bill to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF
ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. However, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, any speeches, under the rule, not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	McCarthy
Anderson	Gore	McClellan
Beall	Green	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Neely
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bush	Hill	Payne
Butler, Md.	Hoyer	Purtell
Byrd	Holland	Robertson
Capehart	Humphrey	Russell
Carlson	Hunt	Saltonstall
Chavez	Jackson	Schoeppel
Clements	Jenner	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Sparkman
Douglas	Kerr	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworschak	Knowland	Thye
Eastland	Kuchel	Tobey
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ferguson	Long	Welker
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVEY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

REPORT ON ADVANCE PLANNING PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourteenth quarterly report on the administration of the advance planning program, dated March 31, 1953, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 35

"Joint resolution relative to renegotiation of contracts between the United States and public agencies for water supply from the Central Valley project of California

"Whereas the United States has entered into numerous contracts with irrigation districts and similar agencies for a supply of water from the Central Valley project, which contracts provide for payments to be made upon construction costs of the project and, in some instances, upon construction costs of local distribution systems; and

"Whereas these contracts have been entered into pursuant to section 9 (e) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of Wyoming has held provisions of the so-called '9 (e)' contracts invalid; and

"Whereas in at least two instances, superior courts of California, in considering the matter of the validity of such contracts, have held them invalid in several particulars; namely, the provisions of such contracts which deal with the matters of water rights, credit for payments made upon such contracts, and limitations as to the use of water; and

"Whereas in some instances irrigation districts have secured validation of some of such contracts by default, and are now confronted with the problem of being forced to carry out contracts which as to other districts have been declared invalid; and

"Whereas litigation concerning such contracts might extend over a long period of time, causing great uncertainty as to the rights and powers of irrigation districts and similar public agencies with respect to the Central Valley project of California; and

"Whereas the form of contracts used in connection with the Central Valley project of California should be in accord with the requirements of the laws of the State of California and the United States and should not contain features which have been held invalid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Secretary of Interior of the United States be requested to renegotiate the existing contracts to provide a more acceptable contract and one that can be uniformly used within the Central Valley project of California and which will avoid the invalid and objectionable features of the existing contracts; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Interior of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to include rice and taro grown in the Territory under the Federal agricultural price support program

"Whereas the products of taro and rice constitute the staple diet of a majority of the people of the Territory; and

"Whereas the Territory is presently dependent upon outside sources for almost all of the rice consumed in the Territory; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory have from time to time suffered from a shortage in the supply of rice and from high prices resulting therefrom; and

"Whereas the geographical position of the Territory makes it essential to produce locally as much of such staples as possible; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of the legislature that the continued deterioration of the taro and rice industries in the Territory and the continued decrease in supply of the products of such industries is inimical to the public interest, and that in the interest of and for the welfare of the people of the Territory it is necessary to rehabilitate and to encourage the development of these basic agricultural industries; and

"Whereas the Congress has passed numerous legislative measures assisting farmers to obtain parity prices for basic agricultural commodities: Now, therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to include rice and taro grown in the Territory of Hawaii among the basic agricultural commodities which are under the provisions of price support programs administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture.

"SEC. 2. That authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Approved this 20th day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint resolution requesting Congress of the United States to authorize the commissioner of public lands to exchange certain public lands for private lands of equal value required by the city and county of Honolulu for school purposes

"Whereas certain privately owned lands are required by the city and county of Honolulu for school sites; and

"Whereas other lands of equal value, owned by the Territory, are available for exchanges with the owners of such privately owned lands; and

"Whereas in order to effect such exchanges the limitations imposed by section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act should be waived: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully requested to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii to make certain exchanges of public lands without regard to acreage and value limitations for the purpose of acquiring privately owned land needed as public-school sites; and to that end the Congress of the United States is requested and urged to adopt a bill substantially in the following form, to wit:

"A bill to authorize the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange certain public lands for private lands of equal value required for school purposes

"Be it enacted, etc.:

"SECTION 1. Any limitations imposed by section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (31 Stat. 141), to the contrary notwithstanding, the commissioner of public lands, with the approval of the Governor and two-thirds

of the members of the board of public lands, is authorized to exchange public lands for private lands of equal value required by the city and county of Honolulu as school sites for the Kahala Elementary School, Waiālae High School, and Koko Head Elementary School on the island of Oahu.

"Sec. 2. The lands received in the exchange authorized by section 1 shall, except as otherwise provided, have the same status and be subject to the same laws as the lands given in the exchange.

"Sec. 3. This act shall take effect upon its approval."

"Sec. 2. That certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 19th day of May A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted at a convention of district 402 of Lions International, at Hobbs, Lake County, Calif., relating to an investigation of water conservation and transportation for the San Francisco Bay area, California; to the Committee on Public Works.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Hopi Indian Sovereign Nation, Hoteville, Ariz., signed by George Nasewesuma, and sundry other Hopi Indians, remonstrating against the drafting of Hopi Indians into the Armed Forces because of their religious beliefs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO AUTHORITY OF TREATIES—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion at Indianapolis, Ind., relating to Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment of the Constitution regarding authority of treaties.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 70

AMEND UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION REGARDING AUTHORITY OF TREATIES

Whereas subsection I of article VI of the Constitution provides that all treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land, binding on the judges in every State, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding; and

Whereas subsection II of article II of the Constitution provides that the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of Senators present concur; and

Whereas the Senate by a vote of one Senator, in the absence of a point of order as to lack of a quorum, might ratify a treaty; and

Whereas Senate Joint Resolution 1, by Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, and 63 of his colleagues, and Senate Joint Resolution 43, sponsored by the American Bar Association, would, if reconciled as to language and ap-

proved by the Congress, give the American people opportunity to consider fully the possible operation, effect, and implications of the treaty-making powers, and, if approved by the people as by the Constitution required, would afford protection of present and existing rights of the people and the States under the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national executive committee of the American Legion, in meeting at Indianapolis, Ind., April 30, 1953, reaffirms the principles of Resolution 426, adopted by the 1951 national convention of the American Legion, and of Resolution 1, adopted by the 1952 national convention of the American Legion, both pertaining to the subject matter of this resolution, and both incorporated in the report of the Special Committee on Covenant of Human Rights and the United Nations, heretofore approved by this national executive committee, and urges early adoption by the Senate and the House of Representatives of a joint resolution which will embody the principles of our aforesaid national convention resolutions and of said Joint Resolution 1 and Joint Resolution 43, now pending before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CARLSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 5 minutes?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is proceeding with morning business by unanimous consent, speeches being limited to 2 minutes. The Chair would suggest that morning business be concluded before other business is transacted.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not wish to have the floor until the morning business is concluded, so I am happy to yield the floor, if I may be recognized later.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. HENNING):

S. 1983. A bill for the relief of Joe Lee (Lee Jow); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 1984. A bill for the relief of Mable Jernigan Bell; and

S. 1985. A bill for the relief of Ida Peggy Vernell; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1986. A bill for the relief of Lou Forrest Sitterson and Melody Yvonne Sitterson;

S. 1987. A bill for the relief of Edmond Kaiser Zahka; and

S. 1988. A bill for the relief of Linda Ann Ramsey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1989. A bill for the relief of Paul Kusmanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1990. A bill to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1991. A bill for the relief of Esperanza Jimenez Trejo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1992. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit all citizens of the United States to receive at least minimum old-age and survivors insurance benefits; and, for the purposes of computing the primary insurance amount of an individual, such individual shall be deemed to have an

average monthly wage of at least \$100; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPEHART (by request):

S. 1993. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, with respect to maximum interest rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1994. A bill to authorize the care and treatment at facilities of the Public Health Service of narcotic addicts committed by State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1990) to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on the bill for not more than 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say to the Senator from North Dakota that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] had asked unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes, but under the unanimous-consent agreement which had previously been entered into morning business was first to be transacted, and speeches were to be limited to 2 minutes. The Chair therefore feels that until the morning business is concluded the request of the Senator from North Dakota to speak for 4 minutes would be out of order.

Mr. YOUNG. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I had intended to make.

There being no objection, the statement by Senator YOUNG was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

The bill which I have today introduced has as its purpose the strengthening of investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act. This measure, if approved, would strengthen the powers contained in the Commodity Exchange Act in two important respects.

First, the bill permits the use of the subpoena power for purposes of investigation, as well as for purposes of formal proceedings. Such authority is now enjoyed by a number of regulatory agencies, including the Securities and Exchange Commission. With this authority persons or firms involved in suspected manipulative activities, and persons having a knowledge of such activities could be questioned as soon as the signs of possible abuses under the act became evident.

I understand there is some uncertainty stemming from the language of the Commodity Exchange Act as to whether the subpoena power shall be available for investigation, as well as other proceedings, under the act itself. The full and free use of the subpoena power in connection with investigations will, in my opinion, immeasurably assist carrying out the intent of Congress as expressed in the basic act.

The second important provision of this measure is one which would permit the use of a permanent or temporary injunction to prevent violations of the Commodity Exchange Act, upon a showing that a person has engaged, or is about to engage, in a practice which is considered to be a violation. The purpose of this provision is to provide a summary-type proceeding to prevent violations before they occur. The merit of such action is obvious. It would result in considerable savings in time and expense by the Government. More important still is the fact that means is hereby afforded for expeditious and effective action by the Commodity Exchange Authority.

Presently a case is pending with respect to alleged violations of the Commodity Exchange Act by Cargill, Inc. This involves the importations of millions of bushels of Canadian oats much to the detriment of our domestic producers.

The Department of Justice has taken the view presently that criminal prosecutions "could not be maintained successfully." However, they are keeping the case open for further appraisal before a final determination is made as to whether criminal prosecutions should be instituted.

The Department of Agriculture, under the Commodity Exchange Act, has authority to institute administrative proceedings against Cargill for its alleged violative practices. Officials of the Department of Agriculture recently admitted in testimony before the agricultural subcommittee that they had reason to believe heavy importation of Canadian oats was being continued at a loss by Cargill, Inc., and possibly other grain firms. They stated, however, that under the existing law there was little or nothing that the Commodity Exchange Authority could do beyond what it had already done to halt such practices.

These continuing imports of Canadian oats have already made it virtually certain that for the third consecutive year United States farmers in 1953 will receive less than parity, and possibly even less than the Government price-support level for their oats. It is abundantly clear that the present act is not adequate to deal with a problem such as this. Therefore, I hope and feel certain that Congress will approve the measure which I have introduced today which would extend the authority of the Department to deal quickly and effectively with these serious violations.

PRINTING OF UNITED STATES WALL MAPS

Mr. JENNER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 30,051 copies of a United States wall map, size 5 by 7 feet, of which 99 copies, mounted and backed, and 7,425 copies, not mounted or backed, shall be for the use of the Senate; and 441 copies, mounted and backed, and 22,050 copies, not mounted or backed, shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. THYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 115), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of \$50,000 for the purpose of discharging obligations incurred by it prior to June 30, 1954, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, Eighty-first Congress. Such sum shall be in addition to any other moneys available to the committee for such purpose, and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INQUIRY INTO INVESTIGATIONS OF POSTMASTERS BY THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MONROE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 116), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to consist of five members of such committee, three from the majority and two from the minority, to be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation with respect to the activities of the Bureau of the Chief Post Office Inspector of the Post Office Department for the purpose of ascertaining (1) whether unwarranted investigations of postmasters are being made by such Bureau, (2) whether improper methods are being employed in any such investigations, and (3) whether any postmasters have been wrongfully removed from office as a result of any such investigations.

Sec. 2. The subcommittee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2969. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property in Prince Georges County, Md., acquired as a site for the National Training School for Girls;

H. R. 3087. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3796. An act relating to the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, District of Columbia;

H. R. 4229. An act to change the name of the Polycultural Institution of America to Polycultural University of America, to grant a congressional charter to such university, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4484. An act to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses;

H. R. 4485. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to publication of partnerships;

H. R. 4486. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer;

H. R. 4487. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as further amended by an act of April 19, 1920 (title 20, ch. 1, sec. 116, D. C. Code, 1951), relating to continuing decedent's business;

H. R. 4550. An act to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property; and

H. R. 4940. An act to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Address entitled "Young Men and Government," delivered by him before the convention of the Maryland Junior Chamber of Commerce on May 23, 1953, in Baltimore, Md.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "The Test of American Leadership," delivered by him before the American Bar Association on May 21, 1953.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Address entitled "Student Exchange Between India and the United States of America" delivered by the Ambassador from India at Syracuse University on April 11, 1953.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for Mr. HENNING):

Address delivered by Jerome Walsh before Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, at New York City on May 4, 1953.

Article entitled "Present Day Lesson of the Louisiana Purchase," written by Clarence K. Streit, and published in Freedom and Union for April 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Statement of 10 evidences indicating a return to the church of its Christian power, from an address by Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church of Washington, D. C., at the annual dinner of the Men's Union of the Washington (Pa.) Presbytery, at Waynesburg, Pa., last week.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Article entitled "Reds Have Master Plan for Middle America," written by Edward Tomlinson, and published in the Washington Daily News of May 25, 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Editorial entitled "Human Values as Well as Money Saved by Sound Parole System," written by Neil O. Davis, editor of the Lee County Bulletin, of Auburn, Ala., and published in the Montgomery Examiner of May 21, 1953.

Article entitled "President's Power in Foreign Policy," written by Carroll Kilpatrick and published in the Washington Post of May 24, 1953.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Editorials from New England newspapers regarding the proposed Federal program relating to the New England economy.

By Mr. PURTELL:

Article entitled "The Story and Life of Dr. Marcus Whitman," written by Georgene Whitman Ross, of Hartford, Conn.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Article entitled "Meddling With Railroad Safety," from the Railway Age for May 4, 1953.

Article entitled "Britain's No. 1 Money Man on His Way to United States," written by Walter Trohan, and published in the Chicago Tribune, May 15, 1953.

**REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2, 1953,
RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE—LETTER FROM
GOVERNOR OF WISCONSIN**

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received this morning a letter from the Governor of Wisconsin endorsing Reorganization Plan No. 2, providing for streamlining the Department of Agriculture.

The letter points out the experiences of my State in cooperation with the USDA in successfully working out vital patterns of Federal-State relationships in the farm field.

I send to the desk Governor Kohler's letter and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

I should like also to note that I have received a message from Gavin McKenow, chairman of the Wisconsin Committee for the Hoover Commission Reforms, endorsing the reorganization plan, and opposing the resolution which would disapprove that plan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Madison, Wis., May 22, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The proposed reorganization of the Department of Agriculture is a matter of great importance to the State of Wisconsin, and I am writing, therefore, to urge you to oppose the resolution of disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, introduced by Senator RUSSELL on April 9.

The experience of our State department of agriculture indicates that the President's plan will do much to provide maximum quality of public service at minimum expense. The State is now cooperating with the USDA in working out patterns of Federal-State relationships in the field of agriculture. This pilot study is expected to provide the basis for attaining cooperation and coordination of effort, never before realized, at every level of government.

While our working relationships with the USDA have been cordial, experience has shown that a great deal of overlapping of functions, duplication of effort, and inconsistent action exists. This reorganization plan, based upon the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, will, we believe, help eliminate wasted effort and wasted tax funds, and provide a long-needed modernization of the USDA.

For these reasons, I hope you will lend your support to the plan by voting against the resolution of disapproval and by soliciting the support of your colleagues in opposition to the resolution.

With good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER J. KOHLER,
Governor.

NATIONAL MARITIME DAY—PROCLAMATION OF GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a proclamation issued by the Governor of the Commonwealth

of Massachusetts, designating Friday, May 22, 1953, as National Maritime Day.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

BY HIS EXCELLENCY, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
GOVERNOR—A PROCLAMATION, 1953

Whereas the American merchant marine is assisting immeasurably in the strengthening of our Nation and the forces of freedom by performing singularly important services in the flow of international trade and travel; and

Whereas gainful employment is now enjoyed by thousands of our skilled workers in shipyards, waterfront activities, railroad, and truck transportation, endeavors which serve our varied industries both with needed raw commodities and the furnishing of an outlet for manufactured products; and

Whereas Boston has produced under the genius of Donald McKay and others many of the famous American vessels of the past so that this tradition—"salt water is the lifeblood of our welfare, furnishing the nourishment upon which our very survival depends"—is today still carried on by the efficient shipbuilders within the Commonwealth; and

Whereas we join the Congress of the United States in honoring the American merchant marine, remembering especially the departure from Savannah, Ga., on May 22, 1819, of the *Savannah* on the first transoceanic voyage by any steamship.

Now, therefore, I, Christian A. Herter, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby designate and proclaim as National Maritime Day, Friday, May 22, 1953, in Massachusetts, and respectfully urge the people of the Commonwealth to cooperate in its observance.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 12th day of May, in the year of our Lord 1953, and of the independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and seventy-seventh.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
His Excellency the Governor.
By LEO M. HARLOW,
Deputy Secretary of the Commonwealth.

**NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN
NOMINATIONS**

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President of the United States sent to the Senate today the nominations of Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria, and to be also United States High Commissioner for Austria, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate; and Harold Shantz, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Notice is hereby given that the nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, in accordance with the committee rule.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM D. MITCHELL TO BE ADMINISTRATOR, SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 3, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William D. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK A. SOUTHARD, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND (RE-APPOINTMENT)

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 3, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 784, TO PROHIBIT BLENDING OF IMPORTED WHEAT UNFIT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION WITH WHEAT SUITABLE FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the special subcommittee on improvements in the Federal Criminal Code, of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 10, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 784, to prohibit the blending of wheat imported unfit for human consumption with wheat suitable for human consumption. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

FIXING OF CERTAIN LICENSING AND REGISTRATION FEES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1324) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees, which was

to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to fix from time to time, in accordance with section 2 of this act, the fees authorized to be charged by the following acts:

(1) The act entitled "An act to regulate steam-engineering in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1887 (ch. 272, 24 Stat. 427, as amended; title 2, ch. 15, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(2) The act entitled "An act to regulate plumbing and gas fitting in the District of Columbia," approved June 18, 1898 (ch. 467, 30 Stat. 477, as amended; title 2, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(3) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906 (ch. 2084, 34 Stat. 175, as amended; title 2, ch. 6, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(4) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907 (ch. 442, 34 Stat. 870; title 2, ch. 8, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(5) The act entitled "An act to define the term of 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," approved February 9, 1907 (ch. 913, 34 Stat. 887, as amended; title 2, ch. 4, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(6) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918 (ch. 82, 40 Stat. 560, as amended; title 2, ch. 7, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(7) The act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923 (ch. 94, 42 Stat. 1261, as amended; title 2, ch. 9, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(8) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia," approved May 28, 1924 (ch. 202, 43 Stat. 177; title 2, ch. 5, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(9) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia," approved December 13, 1924 (ch. 9, 43 Stat. 713, as amended; title 2, ch. 10, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(10) The act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929 (ch. 342, 45 Stat. 1326, as amended; title 2, ch. 1, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(11) The act entitled "An act to define, regulate, and license real-estate brokers, business chance brokers, and real-estate salesmen; to create a Real Estate Commission in the District of Columbia; to protect the public against fraud in real-estate transactions; and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1937 (ch. 760, 50 Stat. 787, as amended; title 45, ch. 14, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(12) The act entitled "An act to provide for the examination and licensing of those engaging in the practice of cosmetology in the District of Columbia," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 321, 52 Stat. 611; title 2, ch. 13, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(13) The act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (ch. 322, 52 Stat. 620, as amended; title 2, ch. 11, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(14) The act entitled "An act to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof," approved July 2, 1940 (ch. 513, 54 Stat. 716; title 2, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(15) The act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944 (ch. 612, 58 Stat. 823, as amended; title 2, ch. 12, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

(16) The act entitled "An act defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineering and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia," approved September 19, 1950 (ch. 953, 64 Stat. 854; title 2, ch. 18, D. C. Code, 1951 edition).

Sec. 2. The Commissioners may after public hearing increase or decrease the fees authorized to be charged by each of the acts listed in the first section of this act to such amounts as may, in the judgment of the Commissioners, be reasonably necessary to defray the approximate cost of administering each of said acts.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on May 25 the House passed Senate bill 1324 with a slight amendment which has no serious effect upon the content of the bill. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

GRAZING LANDS

Mr. BUSH obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has requested the privilege of addressing the Senate for not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Montana for 5 minutes, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that he may yield to the Senator from Montana for not more than 5 minutes, with the understanding that the Senator from Connecticut will not lose his right to the floor. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to protest as strongly as I can against H. R. 4023 and S. 1491.

These measures, in my opinion, constitute a raid by certain private interests on the national forests and, if successful, will lay the groundwork for further attempts to despoil the national parks, Federal wildlife refuges, and other public lands.

Anyone reading these measures can see that what they actually do would be to make a vested right of grazing privileges under the authority of the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture. Under this vested right ranchers could sell or give their grazing privileges to people of their own choosing and the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to accede to it.

Under these measures the public interest in our forests would be subordinated and the grazing privilege would be made paramount over timber production and watershed protection.

These bills will not, as they state, provide for the "improvement and development" of the public lands. These bills are deliberately designed to protect the holders of grazing permits and not the people—all the people—to whom the public domain belongs.

Under sections 6 and 7, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required, where-

ever he permits grazing, to grant continuing grazing privileges to present permit holders and successors of their own choosing. In other words the grazing permit holder and not the Secretary would be the one who would determine who would get all permits in the future.

Section 6 would also prevent the Secretary from making any change in present grazing allotment boundaries or the kind of livestock permitted, and section 7 would also keep him from decreasing the privilege as to the number or kind of stock, or changing allotment boundaries, for any purpose whatever, when a privilege passes to a successor.

There are other dangerous elements to these measures, but I believe I have pointed out enough of the difficulties to convince any reasonable minded person of the threat to the public welfare these proposals contain. I sincerely hope that these bills will be killed in committee, and I hope also that Secretary of Agriculture Benson will make his views known. He has been strangely silent. By his silence he has lent credence to the belief that he has adopted a "hands off" policy which, if true, augurs ill for the Forest Service which he heads. However, the only official comment up until this morning has been by a representative of the Department of the Interior. I hardly need to tell you, that was an endorsement of this questionable proposal. Much to the pleasure of the livestock industry lobbyists who have been swarming over this town during the past 2 weeks, they have it as an open secret that the Secretary of Agriculture and his Forest Service have been placed behind a curtain of some sort on this subject. As a result, no word has come from them about it, although both the House and Senate hearings on these bills will probably close soon.

I call upon Secretary Benson to stand up and be counted on this controversial measure and to let the public and the Congress know whether he is on the side of the people or the special interests.

I also call upon Secretary of the Interior McKay to make his views known to the proper committees and to the people of the country as well. This issue is so important and so far reaching in its possible consequences that it is imperative that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior come from behind the curtain and face up to this issue immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks I may include telegrams and letters I have received from Montana about this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA WOOL
GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
April 30, 1953.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I have just been browsing through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 21, and I find where you made the statement, in questioning the Senator from Washington, "May I ask the Senator from Washington if it is not his belief, that if the cattlemen's grab bill is enacted, what we shall be creating will be, in effect, a revival of the old feudalistic system, by

which leases could be handed down from father to son, and at the expense of the public, great areas of land could be removed from use for the purposes of feeding cattle and sheep, and could be turned over to individuals, for their own particular use, regardless of the number of head of stock grazed on it, and regardless of the damage done to the forage crops?

Mike, we would be very interested in knowing why you refer to this as the "cattle-men's grab bill," and from whom you got your information that it is a grab.

We would also like to know by what method you interpret it to be a revival of the old feudalistic system of handing leases down from father to son at the expense of the public.

We would also like to know what part or section of the bill would allow the removal of great areas of land at the expense of the public for the purpose of feeding cattle and sheep, and we would also like to know, what you mean relative to the damage done to forage crops.

As the Montana Wool Growers Association have been very interested in this legislation, and have had committees working on it for over 2 or 3 years in an effort to bring out a fair and just bill, we feel it is only right that you quote those sections of the bill which you think are detrimental to the public and why you interpret them in this manner.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT E. SHUEY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SOUTHEASTERN MONTANA
LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
Miles City, Mont., April 24, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution passed at our annual meeting held April 18, 1953, which we are very much interested in.

Yours very truly,

I. V. ZOOK, Secretary.

"Whereas greater uniformity and stability of administration of Federal grazing lands is needed to allow and encourage better use and greater development of these lands; and

"Whereas legislation is needed for attainment of these ends;

"Therefore, the Southeastern Montana Livestock Association urges the enactment of the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act, H. R. 4023, and that copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen."

MONTANA STOCKGROWERS
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Helena, Mont.

"Resolution 10

"Whereas H. R. 4023 is the result of several years of study by interested stockmen's and other organizations to further the unified administration of federal grazing lands; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the Montana Stockgrowers Association to further unified practices of land management to foster conservation and protection of our national resources and continuing development of our grazing lands: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, that the Montana Stockgrowers Association wholeheartedly endorse H. R. 4023."

Attest: This is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by vote of the members of the Montana Stockgrowers Association in regular session at Missoula, Mont., May 14, 15, and 16, 1953.

E. A. PHILLIPS,
Secretary, Montana Stockgrowers
Association.

DELL, MONT., May 6, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

For domestic sheep and wool industries to survive, imperative harassing cease, proposed corrective legislation be enacted this session of Congress, and Tariff Commission must act favorably on wool case without further delay. Criticism uniform Federal grazing bill unjustified and unreasonable; defy anyone to find anything derogatory to public interest. Land-grab charge so untrue. It is contemptible. Beseech your active and vigorous support of legislation designed to effect at least partial cure of our sick industries.

WHITWORTH & SONS, INC.

WEST YELLOWSTONE, MONT., May 20, 1953.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,

Montana Senator, Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please record my strongest opposition and yours to S. 1491 in the hearings now being held. This bill special legislation and would ruin our forest watershed and wildlife and would destroy the areas now used for the pleasure of all people. Please send me names of Kentucky Senators.

Regards,

MARIE B. RODMAN.

HELENA, MONT., May 21, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

The Montana Wildlife Federation opposes H. R. 4023 and solicits your assistance in defeating the bill.

E. A. RUDMAN,

President, Montana Wildlife Federation.

FORSYTH, MONT., May 22, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: The members of the Rosebud Treasure County Wildlife Association, composed of 500 sportsmen from the two counties, are strictly opposed to H. R. 4023, the stockmen's land-grab bill. Such legislation is contrary to all that such clubs stand and work for. Your help in killing any and all such legislation will be appreciated.

W. E. CONN,

President.

MISSOULA, MONT., May 16, 1953.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senator from Montana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In reference to bill H. R. 4023, the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act, I wish to state I am against it.

Reasons: It gives the big rancher too much control and crowds out the small stockman. The committee that acts on complaints is made up of the violators themselves.

The taxpayer's money is being used for the good of a few. The taxpayer takes care of the reseeding.

On the whole there seems to be more wrong with the bill than there is good.

Yours truly,

FAY E. KISER.

HAMILTON, MONT., May 16, 1953.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD.

DEAR SIR: I suppose that this letter is unnecessary, but I do want to assure you that my own sentiment and that of everyone to whom I have talked in Hamilton is very much against the land-grab bill, S. 1491.

Sincerely,

J. FREDERICK BELL, M. D.

RONAN, MONT., April 9, 1953.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please send me 4 copies of H. R. 4023, introduced by Congressman

D'EWART, also 4 copies of companion bill introduced by Senators BARRETT and BUTLER.

Very truly yours,

THOS. O. PEASLEY.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of April 9, 1953]

SHALL FORESTS BE PRIVATE PRESERVES?

A dangerous storm is brewing, imperiling national forests of Montana and throughout the Mountain West. It is embodied in identical bills now pending in both branches of Congress. If enacted into law these measures could turn grazing permits on our national forests into legal property rights for the benefit of a comparatively few large livestock operators. In the House this bill (H. R. 4023) has been introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana. Notation that it was introduced by request may indicate that Mr. D'EWART has some reservations regarding it but we believe his sponsorship of it, limited or otherwise, is a serious mistake. In the upper branch a companion bill is sponsored by Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and BUTLER of Nebraska. The bills would reverse the established policy of administering our national forests for the greatest good to the greatest number. That policy recognizes Government control as necessary to safeguard vital resources for the benefit of all the people. Timber and watersheds are given first priority. Other uses are secondary. This overall policy has proved wise and far-seeing. The Forest Service now affords the stockmen considerable protection in the exercise of grazing privileges. Having once granted a rancher a permit to graze a specific number on the national forests, he is accorded preference rights for a similar number as long as he retains his ranch holdings. But limits are established as to how many one owner may graze on the forests and these limits vary in accordance with the economy of the area which surrounds the forests.

The present legislation, could in effect, establish property rights to the grazing permits which could be bought and sold and which could lead to all of the rights eventually going to a few large operators. It would also transfer a major portion of the control and administration of forest grazing lands to advisory boards elected by the permit holders. There are bountiful assets in our public forest lands and a multiplicity of interests some of them conflicting. The grazing privilege is important to the livestock industry. It deserves both practical and fair administration but it does not deserve special advantages that would jeopardize the best long-term interests of the region and the country. We are told that the impetus of this legislation came from the Southwest. There is no conflict in Montana, but there could be in years to come, under such a law. Hence we think it is a bad piece of legislation for Montana as well as for the entire mountain area of public domain.

JORDAN, MONT., May 7, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please send copies of H. R. 4023 and companion Senate bill.

MANUEL J. ROTH.

ROUNDUP, MONT., May 9, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD:

We wish to let you know we are very much opposed to House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491.

We appreciate your opposing these bills as we feel they are unfair to the people except just a favored few.

Sincerely,

CHAS. C. and ETHEL E. SMITH.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, May 14, 1953.
The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senator from Montana,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: This is to acknowledge your note of May 8 referring to my telegram of May 7. I am not out of sympathy with an attempt to economize in Government, but I do think that judgment should be used, and that activities vital to the welfare of the people in one way or another should not be discontinued. I am prejudiced, of course, but I do feel that the establishment of the Montana Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit has placed an emphasis upon wildlife research which would have been difficult to obtain without the cooperation of the Federal Government.

I suspect that it isn't easy to serve as a member of a minority party in a time like this. I don't like some of the things going on, and I am sure you don't. In particular, I don't like the provisions of H. R. 4023 and its companion Senate bill, 1491. I understand that they are identical, although I have only seen a copy of the House bill. For your information I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have filed with the House Subcommittee on Public Lands. I think I know you well enough to know that you will oppose the provisions of this bill. At any rate, I want to register my protest to it.

With best personal regards
Sincerely,

J. W. SEVERY.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, May 14, 1953.
Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Chairman, House Subcommittee
on Public Lands,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN D'EWART: I have had opportunity to study H. R. 4023, a bill which proposes to revise the public-land laws, particularly as they apply to the use of the Federal lands by livestock. I must protest strongly against the passage of this bill which, it seems to me, can only lead to a relaxation of the management standards upon Federal rangelands, particularly those under the administration of the United States Forest Service.

The wording of section 5 seems to give the judgment and recommendations of an advisory board priority over the judgment and recommendations of a trained and experienced man in the field of land management—a man who is responsible to the American people for the maintenance of certain management standards upon public lands.

Sections 6 and 7 appear to tie, unnecessarily closely, the grazing privilege upon public land to so-called base property.

Section 10 seems to make administrative judgment a matter of an agency hearing if there is disagreement followed by court action if the holder of a grazing privilege is still dissatisfied. I cannot see that such delay in administration is in the best interests of the American people, who have joint ownership in these public lands.

The end result of the bill, it seems to me, would be to expose lands, already known to be poorly managed, to a still lower level of management. This is not to damn the holders of grazing permits—many of whom are high-type managers. The statement rather implies that some holders of permits are poor managers, and that this bill plays into their hands and allows poor management to continue. This can only mean the continuation of low-level management in certain areas where water values and wildlife values have little consideration at the present time.

As near as I can make out, there are about 42,000 grazing-privilege holders on Federal public lands in the 11 western-land States.

H. R. 4023 seems to place the special interests of these permit holders against the interests of the several million citizens of those States, as well as the total citizenry of the United States, whose general welfare is certainly in part dependent upon a high quality of public-land management.

Sincerely,

J. W. SEVERY.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 12, 1953.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I sincerely request that you vote against and do all you can to defeat Senate bill 1491.

We cannot permit private interests to dictate the policy of our national forests.

Sincerely,

LEROY SCHELLY.

SQUARE BUTTE, MONT., May 6, 1953.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Hope it isn't necessary to urge that you help defeat Senate bill 1491. Legislation of this type is shocking to say the least.

Yours truly,

RUSSELL ROBISON.

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Glasgow, Mont., May 7, 1953.

Senator JAMES MURRAY.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.
Representative WESLEY D'EWART.
Representative LEE METCALF.

DEAR SIRS: We strongly urge increased funds for REA electrification, the amount that the REA cooperatives anticipate they will need to borrow during the year. That includes telephone, of course.

We urge Senators to vote against crippling power projects for REA. We know that bill is to come before the Senate. It is unbelievable that our Congressmen want to cripple the REA which has done and does so much to aid the farmer in production as well as comforts.

We do not endorse H. R. 4023 or S. 1491 for the following reason: It would give big livestock men a practically ironclad and exclusive monopoly on use of the national forests and grazing lands for sheep and cattle.

We hope you will do all you can to defeat bill 1559 which would tax cooperatives patronage refunds. It is unnecessary to explain to you why and what it would do to the cooperatives.

Thanking you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

FARMERS UNION CHERRY CREEK LOCAL,
DANIEL J. RICE, Secretary.

THE FROMBERG ROD AND GUN CLUB,
Fromberg, Mont., May 9, 1953.

The Fromberg Rod and Gun Club, at a regular meeting held April 15, 1953, adopted the following resolutions and requested that copies be mailed to Montana Senators and Representatives and to the committee studying H. R. 4023 introduced (by request) by Representative D'EWART, of Montana:

"Be it resolved, That the Fromberg Rod and Gun Club go on record opposing the passage of H. R. 4023 for the following reasons:

"1. Although the bill is high-sounding and altruistic, its very essence is opposing American tradition and defrauding its many citizens of their heritage in order to favor a greedy minority.

"2. It is another step, and a big step, toward giving away what is left of our national domain. This diametrically is opposed to all principles of conservation.

"3. The bill makes a definite change in the basic conception of grazing on forest

lands; that changes it from the status of a privilege granted the lessee by a free people to an inherent right to the Forest Service ground and grass, a right that could then be bought and sold as any chattel property.

"4. It would give the lessee virtual ownership of the land for a few paltry lease dollars and leave the taxpayer the costly job of maintaining the land, reseeding the range, building and maintaining its roads and trails, fighting its fires, etc., while at the same time depriving him more and more of any right to use the forests and forest lands.

"5. The bill tends toward building a monopoly and creating a landed aristocracy at no expense to themselves as opposed to our much-lauded system of free and competitive enterprise.

"6. The bill would lead to eventually depriving all the people of our country of all the forest lands and turning them over to the stockmen and the lumbermen and other self-seeking interests to be controlled and regulated to suit their needs and in total disregard for the public right to access.

"7. Man to be free must have reasonable and free access to the works of nature. The right to commune with your God by contemplating His handiwork is a great natural right. Let us see to it that no power ever again assaults it. Let us impress upon the minds of greedy, selfish interests that in this age of a developing city civilization the public domain shall not be restricted but rather it should be expanded for all the people.

"The gravest danger confronting our social and economic system springs from such illogical and immoral attempts to steal the national heritage and place the heel of economic expediency upon the natural rights of the American people.

"Therefore we request that this bill be killed so emphatically that the powers behind it will be unable to reintroduce it in our time.

"FROMBERG ROD AND GUN CLUB,
"F. J. RAHREK,
"Secretary, Resolution Committee."

MONTANA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL
CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,
Sand Coulee, Mont., May 11, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to Senate bill 1491, I would like to voice my opposition. I have been a farmer and stockman for 32 years. Having served on the Cascade County planning board for 8 years, ACP committeeman for 7 years and county committeeman for 2 years, about 11 years on the FSA and FHA committee, and soil conservation district director for 7 years, I have a great interest in the public land in this State.

I attended the national soil conservation district convention in Cleveland, Ohio, where stockmen from all interested States discussed the subject thoroughly. Although the change in the present law was proposed by stockmen some of the large operators from California and Nevada were personally against such a change.

The deplorable condition of some of our State land, the overgrazed, overstocked condition on too much of our private range is a good indication of what could happen to our forests under Senate bill 1491. I realize the stockmen do have their problems but feel that an equitable agreement could be worked out with the present cooperative Forest Service Administration.

The welfare of our Nation depends on the Forest Service's long-range planning and the absolute control of the utilization of all foliage in our forests.

Therefore, I hope that you do not support Senate bill 1491.

Sincerely yours,

TED PETTYJOHN.

THE VALLEY SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Glasgow, Mont., May 13, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: The directors of the Valley Sportsmen's Association representing 800 members urge you to vote against Senate bill 1491, as it is a bill giving away the national forest lands to special interest groups.

This bill would reduce the present effective management of the national forest lands to a quagmire of court cases in which the special interest groups representing a minority of grazing associations would gain control of these lands. The sportsmen who number 7 million people would lose their rights to the use of these lands for the benefit of 30,000 people.

We want continued wise multiple use of our forest lands. This bill would not give us that wise use. Put the national interest above the private interests and vote against this bill.

Sincerely yours,

CARL A. OGRINC, O. D.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

BOZEMAN, MONT., May 12, 1953.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: While well aware that you need no urging to oppose House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491 (beginning to turn the resources of our national forests over to private interests), we do want to add our voice to the opposition, and good luck to you.

It would be bad enough (though possibly necessary to meet competition) to turn over to Montana all the Government land within its traditional (and actual) boundaries, but to start a wedge to turn it over to private interest is unthinkable.

Congratulations on the work you are continuing to do for us.

Yours sincerely,

HOBART MYRICK,
MABEL MYRICK.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 7, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Regarding Senate bill 1491 which provides for turning over the public grazing lands to the livestock interests, replacing Government control with stockmen's advisory boards.

This would be virtually the end to hunting and fishing by the public. We have a sample of what would happen here in this vicinity. The old Dana Ranch in the Hound Creek area west of Smith River, where it is as much as your life is worth to be caught inside the boundaries of this ranch. Nobody fishes or hunts there except maybe a special friend of the owners.

The public lands must be administered by the Federal Government for the benefit of all the people and to protect these lands from misuse.

The wildlife and fishing in this State is a big business, about a million dollars being received from hunting and fishing licenses. It seems to me that that large a business would justify some protection and promotion by the Federal Government and the State of Montana.

Public lands should be made accessible, as well as streams, for the benefit of the people.

I wish to protest this bill, Senate bill 1491, and request that this letter be made a part of the testimony of the hearings on this bill.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very truly yours,

H. F. McMASTER.

MAY 4, 1953.

The board of supervisors of Pondera County (Mont.) Soil Conservation District at the regular monthly meeting of said board of supervisors held on May 4, 1953, at Conrad, Mont., discussed at great length the D'Ewart bill, known as H. R. 4023, and its Senate companion measure, S. 1491.

The Pondera County Soil Conservation District has 1,051,520 acres of which 106,637 acres are in the national forest within its boundaries and during the year 1952 assisted 215 cooperators.

The board of supervisors believing that conservation of natural resources is of vital importance to the welfare of these United States and its 159 million population; and deeming that H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 are not in the best interest of the public, nor do they follow approved conservation practices. Therefore, the board has passed the following resolution and had the same spread upon the minutes of the meeting of May 4, 1953, and copies mailed to Hon. WESLEY A. D'EWART, chairman, House Subcommittee on Public Lands; Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD, of Montana; Representative METCALF, of Montana; respectfully requesting their disapproval of H. R. 4023 and S. 1491.

"RESOLUTION"

"Whereas H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 vitally affect 140 million acres of public domain and forest lands in 11 Western States; and

"Whereas if these bills are enacted into law then sportsmen and the public in general will find their rights of enjoyment of the national forests placed in serious jeopardy; and

"Whereas at the present time public agencies have the necessary authority to administer public lands under their jurisdiction. Under the provisions of the above bills these agencies would be stripped of such authority and the management of said lands would be placed in the hands of local advisory boards; and

"Whereas the public domain and forest lands affected by H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 are grazing lands and will be utilized by livestock operators it may be assumed that the advisory boards above referred to will be dominated by stockmen; and

"Whereas sections 6 and 7 provide that continuing grazing privileges be granted to present permit holders and successors of their choosing, thus virtually making a permit perpetual. It would be possible to hand it down from generation to generation the same as an estate or to sell the grazing privileges the same as though one were transferring owned property; and

"Whereas national forest regulations at present provide that permittees must own 'base property' in order to get grazing privileges on national forests. H. R. 4023 under section 4 would allow permit seekers to offer leased or occupied lands as base property which practice would likely lead to instability of the livestock industry; and

"Whereas the public, the owners of the public lands, will lose rights and recreational privileges due to special vested rights to be given livestock operators amounting to monopolistic control of the forests and public lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the board of supervisors of Pondera Soil Conservation District, are unalterably and emphatically opposed to the enactment into law of H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 and ask that this resolution be spread on the record of House Subcommittee on Public Lands at the hearing on H. R. 4023 to be held on May 20, 21, 22, in room 1324, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C."

Respectfully submitted,

WALLACE KINGSBURY,
Chairman, Board of Supervisors,
Pondera County Soil Conservation District.

Attest:

CHARLES E. VOSS,
Secretary.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, April 30, 1953.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a Montana property owner, taxpayer, and resident. I also am interested in the conservation and judicious administration of our natural resources and in my field work as a geologist have the chance to observe the present administration of much of our public lands.

I believe that the present administration of our public lands (except possibly the Taylor grazing lands) is in the spirit in which these lands were set aside for the people of the United States. I am, therefore, unalterably opposed to several bills now in committee, namely H. R. 4023, and S. 1491. I urge you to strongly oppose the passage of these bills.

Sincerely,

FRED S. HONKALA, Ph. D.

UPPER YELLOWSTONE ROD AND
GUN CLUB (PARK COUNTY),
Gardiner, Mont., May 12, 1953.

Honorable Senator MANSFIELD:

Over the past several years the people of Montana and the majority of the people in the Western States have become genuinely concerned about our heritage of mountains, woods, lakes, and wildlife. We feel that pending legislation such as House Resolution 4032 introduced by Congressman WESLEY A. D'EWART and Senate bill 1481 by BUTLER and BARRETT are nothing but a cleverly worded land grab in the interest of stockman interests only.

It is also the feeling of the overwhelming majority of our people that these remaining public domain heritages should remain free and intact for the use and enjoyment of all the people of the Nation instead of being controlled by a few stockmen.

This bill as proposed will directly threaten the welfare of our already hard pressed wildlife and would strip the Secretary of Agriculture of the necessary authority to administer the public lands under his jurisdiction. In fact it gives the stockman the right to sell the lands they lease from the Government, which is the public, to interests of their own choosing and to force the Secretary to accept the deal.

This is bad legislation. The public as owners of public lands should know that. We as part of the public feel the laws and policies as they stand have been fair and equitable to all concerned. Why give a few the rights to lands that belong to all of us?

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. GALB, Secretary.

VALIER COMMUNITY CLUB,
Valier, Mont., May 12, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: At the regular monthly meeting of the Valier Community Club, held this 11th day of May 1953, action was taken on H. R. 4023 in which the above club declared itself to be emphatically and unalterably opposed to the above-proposed bill. Furthermore, the club asks that this opposition to H. R. 4023 and its companion measures, S. 1491, be made a matter of record.

This club represents a cross section of this area in that it consists of businessmen, farmers, stockmen, Government employees, etc. With about 250 representation, this becomes of great importance to us.

Yours truly,

EARL CRAWFORD,
President.

Attested to:

DON FREEBURY, Secretary.

BILLINGS ROD AND GUN CLUB,
Billings, Mont., May 12, 1953.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: We wish to go on record as vigorously opposing House bill 4023 and hope you will do everything in your power to kill this bill.

This legislation is favorable to a few at the expense of many.

Yours truly,

DON ELLINGER,
Secretary.

SOUTHEASTERN MONTANA
SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Billings, Mont.

Hon. MIKE J. MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: At the annual meeting of the Southeastern Montana Sportsmen's Association, held at Roundup, Mont., on May 10, the following resolution was adopted:

"Be it resolved, That the Southeastern Montana Sportsmen's Association go on record as opposing the passage of House bill 4023, relating to the control of grazing privileges in the national forests, and that the officers of the association be instructed to write our congressional delegation and the committees considering the bills, stating our opposition to this legislation."

The Southeastern Montana Sportsmen's Association is an association of sportsmen's clubs located within district 5 of the State Fish and Game Commission of the State of Montana. The following is a list of the clubs belonging to the association:

Columbus Rod and Gun Club, Columbus, Mont.

Fromberg Rod and Gun Club, Fromberg, Mont.

Tri-County Sportsmen's Association, Roundup, Mont.

Rosebud-Treasure Wildlife Association, Forsyth, Mont.

Big Horn County Rod and Gun Club, Hardin, Mont.

Bridger Rod and Gun Club, Bridger, Mont.

Custer County Rod and Gun Club, Miles City, Mont.

Red Lodge Rod and Gun Club, Red Lodge, Mont.

Billings Rod and Gun Club, Billings, Mont.

Tongue River Rod and Gun Club, Birney, Mont.

Absarokee Rod and Gun Club, Absarokee, Mont.

Laurel Rod and Gun Club, Laurel, Mont.

Park City Rod and Gun Club, Park City, Mont.

Yours very truly,

DON ELLINGER, President.

BOZEMAN, MONT., May 13, 1953.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senator from Montana,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to D'Ewart bill, H. R. 4023, and the identical Butler-Barrett bill, S. 1491.

The first three pages recite the benefits that would accrue to the public by the passage of this bill. Most, if not all, are now in effect through Forest Service policies and regulations.

"Base property" owned by the permittee as used by the Forest Service refers only to the number of cattle grazed on forest lands said owned land will support without regard to any additional number carried on the same base property. This is exceedingly liberal without additional conditions such as leased and occupied lands, water rights being added. Many stockmen in this locality are carrying more stock than their land will support.

I have seen too much private and unregulated State and private land badly misused to have any faith that a board of stockmen will do anything that is beneficial to public lands.

Sections 6-7 would give vested rights to grazing rights to stockmen. This would add thousands of dollars to the value of the permittee's property. It would preclude any new permittees the use of public lands for grazing unless they purchased some base property at an inflated price because of these sections. One person or company could buy all the grazing on any amount of public lands.

Section 8, it is my belief that if stockmen did not expect a reduction of grazing fees this clause would not have been in the bill. The grazing fee on public land is now below those charged on private lands.

If the Secretary's decisions are subject to review by the courts, important action can be put off for years. No other Government agencies are subject to such review and why should a few stockmen have this privilege?

The Gallatin National Forest in Montana is nearly all confined to three counties, Gallatin, Park, and Sweetgrass. These counties had, according to the latest USDA figures, 1,682 commercial cattle outfits and 374 commercial sheep outfits. Of these 205 cattle and 40 sheep outfits graze on the Gallatin Forest. If this ratio is anywhere near true for other public lands, one can easily see that a very few stockmen would benefit by this bill.

The above are some of the reasons why I object to this bill. Will you please give them consideration before action is taken to make this bill a law?

Very truly yours,

J. K. DWINELLE.

MAY 13.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: We are gratefully aware of your opposition to the "stockman's grazing bill" and urge that you actively fight its passage.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. M. CHESSIN.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, Mont., May 13, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: This letter is to let you know that many of us here in Montana and elsewhere in the western United States are quite concerned about the introduction of H. R. 4023, the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act, and the contemplated introduction of similar bills in the Senate. These proposed legislative actions can hardly be interpreted save as being against the best interests for the whole country in the long run. And where is another philosophy as sound for guiding the use of our country's resources.

I do hope that you will do your best to oppose any legislation of this type which will make public lands the effective property of a few.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN A. CHAPMAN,
Instructor, Department of Zoology.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, May 1, 1953.

Mr. MANSFIELD,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Let this be evidence that we are opposed to any change in administering the forest range lands as proposed in a bill before the legislative groups now, the House bill with D'Ewart's name on it.

Sincerely,

IRVING BOEHLEHEIDE,
FRISCILLA BOEHLEHEIDE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE STATE OF MONTANA,
Helena or Saco, Mont., 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: Due to the fact that I did not have a copy of the Federal Range Code available at the time I received your letter of March 25 and the enclosure from Senator McCARRAN, I was unable to answer it until I could get a copy of the code.

After again making a very careful check of the transfer provisions of the Federal Range Code I still feel that there is very little need for subsection (b), of section 161.7 of the code and am glad to know that Senator McCARRAN is in agreement.

It is hard to write an amendment to the Taylor Grazing Act which would provide for the few justifiable transfers without leaving the law so that some undesirable transfers could be carried out under it. No transfer or a license or permit should be allowed from one owner to another owner unless the land on which the license or permit is based is also transferred with the license or permit. Transfers of this kind are provided for under subsection (a), of section 161.7; subsection (c) provides for the sale of land which is in excess of that necessary for the support of the licensed or permitted livestock which leaves only two classes of cases which could be justified under subsection (b). These are as follows:

1. Cases where the original base property was not entirely satisfactory and the owner has later acquired other land which would improve his position as to his livestock operation. Here a transfer of use without an actual transfer of the license or permit would very likely serve the purpose equally well and by leaving the preference attached to the original base property would eliminate the danger of commercialization of the preference as a sale of the original base property would then result in a loss of the preference. Actually under subsection (b), as now worded, A having land could buy B's land and have the license or permit transferred to his land and then immediately sell the land purchased from B which would make it possible for one or two large landowners to control most of the public land in a district.

2. Where the applicant is the holder of a leasehold without which such property would not have dependency by use or priority. This is so far as I can see the only case where transfer of a license or permit should be allowed without ownership of the base property. The need for this is very questionable.

These words in subsection (b), "Provided, That such transfer will not interfere with the stability of livestock operations or with proper range management and will not affect adversely the established local economy," are so broad as to have little or no limiting effect on transfers of licenses or permits. The transfers carried out in this area indicate that it not only does not limit the transfers but opens the way for much abuse of the rules.

In Montana part- or full-time water is not used as a base for livestock operations but I can see no reason why the same rules would not apply equally well in either case.

As the Federal Range Code is only a set of rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior under authority of the Taylor Grazing Act and the Secretary is subject to much pressure from large livestock interests, I believe the act itself should be amended in section 3, which could be accomplished either by a new bill or by an addition to Senator McCARRAN's bill, S. 31, and the amendment should be substantially as follows:

1. That no transfer of a license or permit from owner to another be allowed without

a transfer of the base property on which the license or permit is based.

2. That no transfer of a license or permit based on ownership of land or of water be allowed to other land or water, but that the actual livestock operation could be conducted from other land or water under the same ownership.

3. That no license or permit based on control of land or of water could be transferred to other land or water except where the applicant is the holder of a leasehold without which such property would not have dependency by use or priority. (The value or need for this is questionable.)

4. Where preferences are no longer needed by the original holder or are lost because of nonuse or for failure to comply with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, they should be reallocated to other landowners who are next in line by reason of preference or need.

I hope that an amendment can be worked up which will accomplish the above suggestions either as an addition to Senator McCARRAN's bill, S. 31, or as a new bill.

Press releases here indicate that Representative D'EWART's bill, H. R. 4023, has a provision for transfer of preferences on forest lands similar to that in the Federal Range Code and if so would be very objectionable as it would bring about the same conditions on the forest lands as are now so objectionable on the public domain lands. Further it would create a vested interest for a few people in the forest lands which belong to all of the people. It also opens the way for a few large livestock interests to control all of the grazing privileges of these lands.

Thanking you for your continued interest, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD BARNARD.

ANACONDA SPORTSMEN'S CLUB,
Anaconda, Mont., April 30, 1953.

ALERTING ALL SPORTSMEN'S CLUBS IN MONTANA AND WYOMING

Subject: Stockmen's grazing bill, H. R. 4032, by which certain Western livestock operators proposed to secure greater control over grazing privileges in the national forests. This bill was introduced by Congressman WESLEY A. D'EWART of Montana.

Whereas over the past several years the people of Montana have become genuinely concerned about our heritages of mountains, woods, lakes, and wildlife; and

Whereas it is the feeling of the overwhelming majority of our people that these remaining public domain heritages should remain free and intact for the use and enjoyment of all people of the Nation; and

Whereas it has been called to our attention that certain Senators and Congressmen from Montana and Wyoming are aiding and abetting the large stock interests of the Rocky Mountain States in a gigantic "land grab" coalition to pass more rights and special privileges into the hands of these big stock interests, who are only a small segment of our total population, and an equally small segment of Western stock growers; and

Whereas such a bill as proposed would directly threaten the welfare of our already hard-pressed wildlife and their habitat;

Therefore, it is the purpose of this club to alert and warn all sportsmen's groups and other citizen conservation groups in the States of Montana and Wyoming to fight this class privilege legislation in whatever effective manner they choose. It is especially advised that besides contacting the Honorable A. L. MILLER (Nebraska), chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D. C., and your own Congressmen, letters and wires should go to eastern Congressmen warning

them what is happening in the West to the Nation's public domain.

Don't be asleep at the switch. Get into immediate action if you wish to conserve your fish and game and recreation.

ANACONDA SPORTSMEN'S CLUB.

BELT, MONT., April 17, 1953.

Honorable Senator MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: We, the undersigned, are unalterably opposed to H. R. 4034.

We consider this a raid upon the public lands of the West.

Ralph F. Cook, Olaf Johnson, John E. Holmes, Jalmer, J. Maki, Rudolph Hahnes, Belt, Mont.; Tom C. Goodman, Geyser, Mont.; Kenneth Johnson, Marvin K. Cook, Bertha P. Maki, Evelyn Warilu, Belt, Mont.; Henry Heikila, Geyser, Mont.; Dorothy Landers, Matt Makila, Elmer R. Maki, Belt, Mont.; Opal Goodman, Geyser, Mont.; John O. Carlson, Wm. Makila, Frank Urlick, Mrs. Frank Urlick, Richard A. Maki, Emily J. Maki, Belt, Mont.; Pauline West, Great Falls, Mont.; Olive G. Crowe, Belt, Mont.; James W. Murphy, Geyser, Mont.; Opal G. Goodman, Secretary, Willow Belt Farmers Union, No. 115, Belt, Mont.

HAMILTON, MONT., April 28, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I sincerely urge you to support H. R. 1972 and help defeat H. R. 4023. I believe H. R. 1972 will give us much needed improvement in our overall conservation. However, H. R. 4023 would defeat the whole purpose. I find the small stockmen here much opposed to H. R. 4023 as they feel the large interests would move in and their rights and the range also.

Montana is very fortunate in having many natural resources and outdoor recreation. The sentiment here is along these lines, but I know very few will take the trouble to voice their wishes.

Sincerely yours,

HARVEY C. ELLIOTT.

MISSOULA, MONT., April 28, 1953.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I have read H. R. 4023 introduced by Mr. D'EWART and S. 1491 introduced by Mr. BUTLER and Mr. BARRETT regarding management of public lands, particularly as to grazing and lease privileges by sheep and cattle men. I am convinced the provisions of this proposed bill are a serious mistake and a step backward.

Our people out here do not want to see the management of our public lands taken from professional and competent people, who are doing a good job now, and placed in the hands of those who may exploit them for their own interests. We want to keep our hunting and fishing privileges and our precious watersheds unimpaired.

Please work against this bill in committee and vote against it should it come up for passage in the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN C. WOOD.

AUGUSTA, MONT., April 21, 1953.

To: Senator MIKE MANSFIELD.
Subject: H. R. 4023.

Request that this letter be made a part of the record and be available at the hearings.

I have read this above-mentioned bill over carefully and the comments on the proposed Uniform Federal Grazing Tenancy Act, and I think it is a bad piece of legislation and

not to the best interests of the general public.

Therefore I ask that adverse action be taken on this above-mentioned bill. Many of my friends with whom I have discussed this bill, also think adverse action should be taken on it.

Yours truly,

ROSCOE O. GEISE.

GERALDINE COMMUNITY
COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Geraldine, Mont., April 23, 1953.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have given consideration to H. R. 4023 and believe it to be highly undesirable. This decision was reached by unanimous vote by the Geraldine Community Commercial Club.

We kindly solicit your help in defeating H. R. 4023.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS E. HERROD, Secretary.

FORESTRY CLUB,
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, Mont., May 13, 1953.
The Honorable MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Reference is made to the bill H. R. 4023, introduced by Mr. D'EWART, and its twin, S. 1491, introduced by Messrs. BUTLER and BARRETT. This act, being known as the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act, proposed by Mr. D'EWART, has been brought to the attention of our forestry club here at the university, and we have spent considerable time in interpreting the exact meaning and consequent fallacies that are to be found in this act.

We find this bill to be very cleverly written and is definitely not the boon to public interests which it proposed to be. It is in actuality the big freeze which will eventually put the whole public domain into the hands of a proportionately small, powerful, and monopolistic few. Those acquiring the bulk of this relatively "free" land will utilize it with little thought of conservation measures as they have virtually nothing to lose. They will reap the profits of the land, Uncle Sam getting practically nothing, while the taxpayer bears the full burden of depreciation. This bill would give the Secretary no more authority than he already has and would seem to require of him only that which would benefit the lessee of the land. Furthermore, any decision made by the Secretary could be appealed in the civil courts, which would attempt to abrogate the Administrative Procedure Act, which adheres to the idea that administrative decisions under statutory authority are not reviewable in courts unless capricious or illegal.

These are a few of the major points which are brought out in detail by the emergency committee on natural resources in reference to this bill. It is very poor legislation, as can be readily seen after reviewing both sides of the issue. We would very much like to see this bill defeated.

Very sincerely,

GERALD WRIGHT, President.

BELT, MONT., May 6, 1953.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: In regard to D'EWART's bill No. 4023, I wish to inform you that I'm very much concerned over the outcome of this land grab.

I'm a small permit holder in the national forest and I'm dependent on this for my summer pasture; in fact, my livelihood depends on it. My father had it before I did, a matter of some 35 years or so.

Now grass is a natural resource same as minerals, oil, and waterpower, and the only way it can be utilized is by grazing it to livestock which assures food for the Nation, a living for the small cattleman, and revenue for the Government in grazing fees and taxes.

Now, Mr. MANSFIELD, I wish you would do everything in your power to defeat this and any other bills that threaten our national forests which are our playgrounds and recreation areas. Keep up the good work in behalf of Montana.

Yours truly,

HARVEY W. TALVI.

MISSOULA, MONT., May 14, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am writing in favor of your opposition to the D'Ewart bill, H. R. 4023, and the Butler-Barrett bill, S. 1491.

Recognizing the length of time you have represented the people of this State I hope and urge that you use your accumulated knowledge to the utmost active opposition possible.

To me, the most dangerous section of the bill is section 7 in which it is made possible for a permittee to transfer his grazing privilege to successors.

Yours truly,

Mrs. MILDRED SWACKHAMER.

WESTERN MONTANA FISH
AND GAME ASSOCIATION,

Missoula, Mont., May 16, 1953.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Over the course of many years the Western Montana Fish and Game Association has consistently supported the cause of better management of both public and private lands. It has followed this policy in the belief that high-type land management not only will serve the best interests of the American people but that it will also provide better conditions for the production of wildlife.

Having considered the provisions of H. R. 4023, it is the judgment of the association that this bill, if passed, could only lead to poorer quality land management on much of the Federal land holdings of the West rather than lead to better quality land management. It is its judgment that the provisions of the bill would tend to degrade water and wildlife values in many areas, thus working against the best interests of the general public which has joint ownership of Federal public lands.

The Western Montana Fish and Game Association, consisting of 2,500 members, therefore, goes on record as opposed to the passage of H. R. 4023. We hereby request that this letter be made a part of the record of the hearing.

Sincerely,

ELMER J. STOWE,
Secretary.

GLASGOW, MONT., April 16, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD: The Farmers Union, Local No. 94, goes on record as opposing H. R. 4023 because they feel this bill would be harmful to the small stockman. The local also is against H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CLARA ISAKSON,
Secretary, Farmers Union,
Local No. 94.

CASCADE COUNTY TRADES
AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,

Great Falls, Mont., April 18, 1953.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: The Cascade County Trades and Labor Assembly is

strongly opposed to proposal for an act, House bill 4023.

We feel that you are elected to represent the people of Montana, in Washington, D. C., and should support legislation beneficial to the residents of the State as a whole.

We note that section 5 of this bill places national forest grazing privileges under local advisory boards similar to those which now supervise administration of Taylor Grazing Act lands. Such boards are notoriously controlled by livestock interests and could not be expected to function in the best interests of all the people.

We do not believe in the principle of vested rights in the national forest grazing lands.

The assembly hopes you will defeat this proposed measure in the interest of democracy.

Very truly yours,

JOHN EVANKO, Jr., Secretary.

OPHEIM, MONT., April 16, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill H. R. 4023 introduced by Representative D'Ewart. Also against Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HAZEL MILLER, Farmer.

FORT BENTON, MONT., April 17, 1953.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I urge you to consider H. bill 4023 and to do everything you can to defeat this bill. It won't be necessary for me to point out the hazards and injustices in this bill for I am sure that you are aware of them. A chosen few should never obtain dominance in control of our resources. They should be kept in trust and administered for the people as a whole. The passage of this bill will give way for exploitation. I think further that the Forest Service is doing a fine job in managing our grass and timber tracts in contrast to Taylor grazing lands. Do all you can to defeat this. Will you?

I want to add now that the above is off my chest that I think you are doing an excellent job representing the people of this State and of the whole country.

Thank you.

GEORGE PUCKETT.

GREAT FALLS LODGE, No. 1046,
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,

Great Falls, Mont., April 20, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Seems funny to call you Senator but it is nice. I'm writing to you to tell you that this lodge request your help in defeating House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'Ewart, as we feel that this bill is not in the best interest of the general public. That is, of course, if the bill passes the House.

We are also opposed to turning over the tideland oil to the different States. We know that you are against this too but thought that you would like to know our viewpoint.

Thanking you in advance, I remain

Sincerely,

EDGAR R. LINN,
Recording Secretary.

STANFORD, MONT., May 4, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Wesley D'Ewart's grazing bill, I believe No. 4023, looks like a bad one to me and I have no doubt you are of the same opinion.

Hope it does not pass.

Am also definitely in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway, think it would be a great thing for the United States.

Would also like to see the farmer PMA committees continued as they are. Think we should have acreage control or marketing quotas or both to keep down burdensome surpluses.

Yours very truly,

J. H. WILSON.

GLASGOW, MONT., April 16, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD: I wish to express my opinion on H. R. 4023, introduced by Representative D'Ewart, of Montana. I am opposed to this bill, also the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ETHEL WARD.

GLASGOW, MONT., April 16, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I wish to express my opinion on H. R. 4033, introduced by Representative D'Ewart, of Montana.

I am opposed to this bill, also the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Yours truly,

ALYCE BECK.

GREYBULL, WYO., April 17, 1953.

Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

"Resolved by the Greybull Rod and Gun Club in the regular meeting held April 6, 1953, That said legislation bill No. H. R. 4023, introduced by Congressman D'Ewart, of Montana, and bill No. 1491, introduced by Senator FRANK BARRETT, of Wyoming, both bills being identical in nature, vesting the rights to a few individuals to exploit our forests and mountains at their discretion, to the detriment of 90 percent of the people of Wyoming and our Nation in general. By majority vote, this club goes on record in urging the defeat of this bill; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Wyoming delegation in Congress, to the Montana delegation in Congress, to the Governors of the States of Montana and Wyoming, to the Montana Federation of Wild Life, to the Wyoming Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, and to all other clubs and groups interested in the protection of our mountains and wildlife of Wyoming and the other western States involved."

Sincerely,

GREYBULL ROD AND GUN CLUB,
By R. L. DOCKERY, President.

Attest:

JEANNETTE DOETER, Secretary.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., April 18, 1953.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Meat Cutters and Butchers Local, No. 479, of Great Falls, Mont., at their regular meeting held April 15, 1953, took action against H. R. 4023 pertaining to leasing of forest lands to stockmen.

We believe that these forest lands should be preserved for the public, to be used as recreational centers, also for the preservation of wildlife. When these lands are leased to stockmen they usually keep the public off from these lands, thereby the public is deprived of recreational facilities. We hope you will vote against this bill when it comes up for passage.

We also took action against giving the tidelands oil to the States bordering on these tidelands. We believe that the oil on these lands should be held by the Nation as a

whole for the purpose of educating our children and building facilities to educate them.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. DUSAK,
Secretary, Butchers and Meat Cutters Local Union No. 479.

GLASGOW, MONT., April 16, 1953.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MANSFIELD: I wish to express my opinion on H. R. 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana.

I am opposed to this bill, also the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Yours truly,

THEO. BECK.

OPHEIM, MONT., April 16, 1953.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART; also against Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD DAVENPORT,
Stockman.

OPHEIM, MONT., April 16, 1953.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART.

Also against the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.
Mrs. DELLA STEVENS.

OPHEIM, MONT.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART; also against Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MABEL WESTLY.

OPHEIM, MONT., April 16, 1953.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am opposed to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative W. D'EWART; also against the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

Sincerely yours,

ADOLPH WESTBY,

OPHEIM, MONT., April 16, 1953.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana; also to the Mason bill, No. 1559.

Respectfully,

L. B. TAYLOR.

OPHEIM, MONT.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my opposition to House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART; also against the Mason bill, H. R. 1559.

N. E. STEVENS, Farmer.

MISSOULA, MONT., April 11, 1953.

MIKE: I assume you are fully informed on the subject of the following editorial. If you are not and wish further information I am sure you can get it by a request to our office for someone to brief you.

Senator MURRAY is in a strategic position with his membership on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He should have the facts available to him also. Forest Cooper is a legal adviser to the southern cattlemen who sponsor this legislation. I

feel sure you appreciate the significance. Hearings on the D'EWART bill are scheduled for about May 20. Aiken and Hope have introduced bills to help the situation.

Regards,

PETE HANSON.

(Enclosure)

[From the Great Falls Tribune of April 9, 1953]

SHALL FORESTS BE PRIVATE PRESERVES?

A dangerous storm is brewing, imperiling national forests of Montana and throughout the mountain West. It is embodied in identical bills now pending in both branches of Congress. If enacted into law these measures could turn grazing permits on our national forests into legal property rights for the benefit of a comparatively few large livestock operators.

In the House this bill (H. R. 4023) has been introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana. Notation that it was introduced by request may indicate that Mr. D'EWART has some reservations regarding it but we believe his sponsorship of it, limited or otherwise, is a serious mistake. In the upper branch a companion bill is sponsored by Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and BUTLER of Nebraska.

The bills would reverse the established policy of administering our national forests for the greatest good to the greatest number. That policy recognizes Government control as necessary to safeguard vital resources for the benefit of all the people. Timber and watersheds are given first priority. Other uses are secondary. This overall policy has proved wise and farseeing.

The Forest Service now affords the stockmen considerable protection in the exercise of grazing privileges. Having once granted a rancher a permit to graze a specific number on the national forest, he is accorded preference rights for a similar number as long as he retains the ranch holdings. But limits are established as to how many one owner may graze on the forests and these limits vary in accordance with the economy of the area which surrounds the forests.

The pending legislation could, in effect, establish property rights to the grazing permits which could be bought and sold and which could lead to all of the rights eventually going to a few large operators. It would also transfer a major portion of the control and administration of forest grazing lands to advisory boards elected by the permit holders.

There are bountiful assets in our public forest lands and a multiplicity of interests—some of them conflicting. The grazing privilege is important to the livestock industry. It deserves both fair and practical administration but it does not deserve special advantages that would jeopardize the best long-term interests of the region and the country.

We are told that the impetus for this legislation came from the Southwest. There is no conflict in Montana, but there could be in years to come, under such a law. Hence we think it is a bad piece of legislation for Montana as well as for the entire mountain area of public domain.

GRASSHAVEN RANCHES,
Missoula, Mont., April 7, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: Your letter of March 10 came during my extended stay at the ranch near Billings. I am writing County Agent Thomas at Hamilton asking that he send you a copy of the ARC plan developed at the grass roots for Ravalli County. I hope you will urge Secretary Benson to give this locally developed plan his sympathetic support. I believe it is in harmony with ideas that Benson has expressed.

MIKE, I am really alarmed over the threat to our public lands and related resources

that is clearly developing from various directions such as the offshore oil question. Another is H. R. 4023 by D'EWART and a similar bill in the Senate by BARRETT and others. I believe you know that it will be a sorry day for the smaller stockmen with permits on national forests and grazing districts if these bills become law. As one of them I hope you will do everything consistently possible to oppose this legislation cooked up by a little group of nonrepresentative stockmen who have worked for years for legislation that would give them an unfair advantage and open the door to the plunder of public property.

Sincerely yours,

LEON C. HURTT,
Range and Ranch Consultant.

ELKHORN HOT SPRINGS,
Polaris, Mont., May 7, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am writing in great concernment about the possibility of the passage of S. 1491, commonly called the stockmen's bill.

Senator MANSFIELD, I am unequivocally opposed to this so-called conservation bill and urge you to do your utmost in seeing and working toward its defeat.

This bill will not only aid the large cattleman and bring about the destruction of the small rancher. Not only will this bill ruin the small man it will bring about the desecration of our public lands and national forests.

Permit the rancher to have free use of the lands and forests and the lumbermen will then step up and place their foot in the door and demand their "vested rights."

We cannot permit the few to ruin our watersheds, close the playgrounds of thousands of people, stifle the propagation of our animals and fish, and impoverish the small cattleman.

Senator MANSFIELD, as a Senator from a great Western State, one in which tourists play a huge part in our income, I once again urge you to work toward the defeat of S. 1491.

Most sincerely,

CHARLES W. HAIGHT, Jr.

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, May 1, 1953.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is my hope that you will help to defeat, or in any case modify, Senate bill 1491, the so-called stockman's bill.

Sincerely,

LUDVIG G. BROWMAN,
Chairman, Department of Zoology.

BELT, MONT., May 8, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD:
We go on record against H. R. 4023. There are 106 members.

TIGER BUTTE FARMERS UNION, No. 47,
LEE ROY SMITH, Secretary.

DEER LODGE, MONT., May 6, 1953.
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Congressman From Montana,
Washington, D. C.:

This is a copy of a letter of protest sent to WESLEY A. D'EWART for introducing H. R. 4023:

"We, the undersigned, are just a few of the people who resent and condemn your introduction and support of H. R. 4023. Why are you trying to take from the people control of public forest and grazing land to give to the large livestock operators?"

Twenty signatures accompanied this letter.

We were pleased to note you were against the above measure and are taking this means to let you know we approve your action.

Respectfully yours,

L. D. AKERS.

HELENA, MONT., May 5, 1953.

Chairman WESLEY D'EWART,

Subcommittee on Public Lands, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having been born and raised in Montana, as most of my friends were, and being ardent sportsmen as well as being vitally interested in our national forests, which must be preserved unrestricted for future generations to enjoy, we are very much opposed to the passage of H. R. 4023 as well as Senate bill 1491.

We are in full accord with the letter of April 8, 1953, from Robert Yeoman, president of the Cascade County Wildlife Association, addressed to you and request that you and Representative LEE METCALF, if he is in favor of it, withdraw your personal support from this bill and that it receive an unfavorable report.

A copy of this letter is being sent to Representative LEE METCALF as well as to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, together with the request that the Senators take similar action with regard to Senate bill 1491.

Would your efforts not be better directed in securing additional funds to combat the disease that is killing millions of trees in Montana and the Pacific Northwest as, if this dread disease is not stopped, there will be no national forests or forests on private lands for anyone to enjoy.

Your earnest support is solicited.

Very truly yours,

NORMAN J. HATCH.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 4, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a citizen and sportsman of Montana, I go on record as being opposed to the passage of House bill 4023.

It is my understanding that the national forests were created for the enjoyment and use of all the people of this country. As I see it, this bill would turn over our national forests to a selected few, who could control all rights on this land for decades to come. The present policy of grazing in the national forests is adequate to serve both the stockman and other interests and yet allow the other people of this country to enjoy them.

I am certainly against any bill or provision that leads, or that could lead, to the capture of our national forests and lands by a minority group.

Yours very truly,

ANGELO PAUL MATTEUCCI.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 7, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: I resent the powerful interests that are backing the bills H. R. 4023 and S. 1491.

The bills would turn grazing privileges on the public's national forests into private preserves for the benefit of the greedy few.

I will be looking to you to protect our interests so that we can continue to enjoy the beauty spots of Montana.

I request that this letter be made part of the testimony of the hearing of these bills.

Sincerely,

LILY MCKENZIE
Mrs. J. McKenzie.

LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER

SPORTSMEN'S COUNCIL,

Vancouver, Wash., May 16, 1953.

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART,

Congressman from Montana,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

CONGRESSMAN WESLEY A. D'EWART: It has come to my attention that you presented H. R. 4023 "by request." It is hoped that it was due to the pressure of your daily work and shortage of time to thoroughly examine this thing that you did present it. If you presented it with full knowledge of the content of the bill, and, if passed, the effect that it would have upon our public domain, I am afraid that the good people of Montana have been taken for a ride.

Having been a long-time resident of Missoula, Mont., and being very proud of the State, its history, and pioneers, I am very sorry to see such legislation as this come from a Representative of this very great and respected State.

I trust, now that you have been made aware of the full intent of H. R. 4023, that you will not do anything to further its passage, but will try to have it withdrawn. It is more honorable to admit an error of judgment than to continue with a thing like H. R. 4023.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD E. NELSON,

President.

DEAR MIKE: Congratulations on your new place in Washington. It looks like the quality of the Senate is going up and that of the House is going down—if H. R. 4023 is any indication.

I am proud of you, MIKE, on the stand you took on the tidelands bill. I read a portion of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 4, 1953, volume 99, No. 80. Now, for the sake of some of our other land, do what you can to stop H. R. 4023. I can assume that from your stand on the tidelands bill that you would feel the same about H. R. 4023. Elinor sends greetings and best wishes to Maureen.

Keep up the good work, MIKE. I would like to hear from you if you get a free moment.

Conservationally yours,

HOWARD NELSON.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 4, 1953.

The Honorable Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I wish to register my opposition to House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491. You undoubtedly are more familiar with the expected workings of these than I, but as a matter of policy, not as a sportsman, but as a citizen of the United States, it seems to me that both of these bills should be killed.

I respectfully request that this letter be made a part of the testimony of the hearings on these bills before the respective committees.

Yours very truly,

FLOYD S. WEIMER.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 4, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am enclosing a clipping from the Great Falls Tribune, which is self-explanatory, and I wish to enter my protest against House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491.

I also want to mention something else—in regard to the GI loan—most of these men figure they are discriminated against and I believe if the down payment on homes for GI's was reduced to 10 percent instead of 20

percent that the loan companies demand in Montana and the payments spread over a longer period of time—it would offset a lot of the dissatisfaction among them at this time.

I am a member of the American Legion and a good listener.

Senator, I do hope this information will be of some interest to you.

With every good wish, I am,

Respectfully,

JOHN D. REARDEN.

(Enclosure)

[From the Great Falls Tribune]

EXCERPTS FROM AN OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESSMAN D'EWART

CASCADE COUNTY WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION,

April 8, 1953.

Chairman WESLEY D'EWART,

Subcommittee on Public Lands
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of directors of our organization, representing over 1,800 sportsmen in this area, voted unanimously to go on record as being very much opposed to the passage of H. R. 4023 for the following reasons:

Section 5 of your bill places national forest grazing privileges under local advisory boards similar to those which now supervise administration of the Taylor Grazing Act lands. We wish to go on record that we do not favor putting the national forest under local advisory boards as we do not feel that this type of supervision is in the best interests of all the people.

Administrative decisions by the Forest Service or Land Management Bureau under your bill would be made subject to court review. Under such an arrangement, Federal authority to manage and protect would be greatly weakened. Were they so inclined, powerful financial interests could prolong court action indefinitely * * * possibly for years; meanwhile, disputed range could become irretrievably ruined.

Sections 6 and 7 of your bill would give holders of established grazing privileges "first preference for continued use" and entitle them "to transfer their grazing privileges as they stand at the time, to successors." What you are proposing is a vested right in the national forest grazing lands. You would transfer to a tiny minority of western livestock men a vested right to use and sell grazing privileges in the forests which belong to the public at large.

We are not opposed to the wise multiple use of what remains of our once vast public lands. We subscribe to the theory that there must be a balance of activities and that one use cannot be to the exclusion of all others to favor any one group. Watershed, mineral, grazing, timber, recreational and wildlife must all be considered in a balanced program. Your bill, H. R. 4023, is in our opinion decidedly detrimental to the best interests of all the people and we therefore respectfully ask that—

First. H. R. 4023 receive an unfavorable report and

Second. That you withdraw your personal support from this special interest legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT YEOMAN,
President.

A VALUABLE PUBLIC ASSET IS AT STAKE

House bill 4023, introduced by Representative D'EWART, of Montana, and an identical Senate bill 1491, would turn grazing privileges on the public's national forests into private preserves for the benefit of a comparatively few western stockmen. Under these bills, grazing privileges would become private property and Government control would be replaced by stockmen's advisory boards.

PROTECT YOUR INTEREST

Our forests belong to everyone. Limited grazing is essential to a well-balanced program of wise multiple use. But unless you take steps to protect your share now, you may wake up to find that the lands, within which your favorite picnic spots and fishing streams are located, are being managed primarily for the benefit of stockmen and that your favorite hunting grounds are bare of feed and game.

WE NEED YOUR HELP

Powerful interests are behind these bills. We need a storm of letters to defeat them. It's your fight, get into it. Write a letter to each Member of our Montana congressional delegation protesting these two bills. Mention the bills by number, House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491. Request that your letter be made a part of the testimony of the hearings on these bills. Below are the addresses you need.

Representative WESLEY D'EWART and Representative LEE METCALF, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

CASCADE COUNTY WILDLIFE ASSOCIATION.

BUTTE MOTOR CO.,

Butte, Mont., April 9, 1953.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,

United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: According to this morning's Great Falls Tribune, there has been a bill introduced by Representative D'EWART, H. R. 4023, which refers to grazing permits on our national forests, and according to the editorial, a companion bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senators BARRETT, of Wyoming, and BUTLER of Nebraska.

According to this editorial, this is certainly legislation which we should carefully consider before allowing it to pass.

I know that you will give it your consideration but thought it advisable to write you.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE B. SCHOTTE.

MONTANA ASSOCIATION OF

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS,

Highwood, Mont., March 31, 1953.

MR. EZRA TAFT BENSON,

Secretary of Agriculture,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: I have recently received a copy of the bill, H. R. 4023, called the Uniform Federal Grazing Land Act. After having studied it over, I see many objectionable features which could have a very devastating effect on 20 million people living in the West.

There are approximately 2,000 communities in the Western States which are entirely dependent upon the mountain ranges for their domestic water supplies. The proper handling of these ranges directly affects the 150,000 irrigated farms in the West, and in turn the food production from these areas affects the population of the Nation. From this standpoint, therefore, no individual or group of individuals should ever have the right to direct management for selfish interests with no regard for the interests of others.

On Friday morning, March 13, 1953, our National Association of Soil Conservation District Directors met in your office with Under Secretary Coke and yourself. In your remarks I understood you to say that you desired to build grass-roots agricultural programs from the recommendations of the people from the field. Therefore, I am taking this liberty of voicing my objections to the above-mentioned bill, which I am sure is not in the interest of the majority of the people.

Some of the more objectionable features are outlined below:

The balance of power lies with the advisory boards in the administration of public grazing lands. A wildlife representative is authorized in an advisory capacity, but water, timber, recreation, and other interests are denied representation. Actually, the water alone from a given range may far outweigh the production of forage in value.

Existing permits would be frozen in the hands of those who hold them, regardless of whether they are of a temporary nature.

The sale of permits without limitation and as personal property opens the door to the creation of huge monopolies and to speculation in the purchase and sale of grazing permits.

Increased grazing capacity, although resulting from range improvements constructed from public funds, must be distributed to existing permittees regardless of other small dependent operators.

I do not believe that multiple interests can be properly safeguarded, or renewable resources properly managed subject to the Administrative Procedures Act.

In spite of the fact that this bill was introduced by a Montana man, I am sure that it is not endorsed by the majority of the people of this State. I sincerely hope that you will use your best efforts to defeat a selfish motive of this kind.

Yours very truly,

GORDON MCGOWAN,

Director, National Association of Soil Conservation Districts.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 22, 1953.

Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

I understand you are opposing D'EWART'S H. R. 4023. I am a small stockman running about 140 head of cattle in the national forest. I appreciate very much your opposition to this bill which is very dangerous to the well-being of all the people.

CAMP BROS.,
SIDNEY CAMP.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 22, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

I am a small stockman with over 30 years' grazing rights. If H. R. 4023 passes I feel that I will lose my rights and be wiped out. I would like the law to remain as is.

HUNT BROS.,
FRANCES HUNT.

MONARCH, MONT.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 22, 1953.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Urge your present strong opposition to H. R. 4023 and S 1491, very dangerous legislation that will give a few stockmen a vested right in the public domain. Montana is very much interested since we have millions of acres of national forest and Department of Interior land within our boundaries. Our thousands of small family farmers and stockmen will be squeezed out of the picture entirely as lessees. They are already disadvantaged in the fact of present leasing arrangements, and H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 will make matters much worse. This legislation not only sharply limits opportunities for small stockmen but encourages bad conservation practices and opens way for unmerciful overgrazing of great Montana watersheds that feed other States. The national forests in Montana are a source of valuable timber. Provide water for human consumption, sanitation, irrigation and power, and offer recreation to all citizens regardless of station in life. This legislation

allows a relatively few large stockmen to put paralyzing hands on great areas in which the general public has a vital interest. Please make our opposition to H. R. 4023 and S. 1491 emphatically clear.

RICHARD C. SHIPMAN,
Acting President, Montana Farmers Union.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 24, 1953.

Senator MANSFIELD,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

I am a small stockman. If H. R. 4023 passes I feel I will lose by grazing rights and be ruined. Would like law to remain as is. Thank you.

GUS R. OLSON.

MONARCH, MONT.

GARFIELD COUNTY SOIL

CONSERVATION DISTRICT,

Jordan, Mont., May 19, 1953.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,

Senate From Montana,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: Enclosed is a copy of the resolution adopted by the Garfield County Soil Conservation District, of Garfield County, Mont., concerning S. 1491 and H. R. 4023, recently introduced legislation relative to the Federal lands of the United States.

This resolution is forwarded in accordance with its terms and for the purposes therein stated.

Sincerely yours,

MANUEL J. ROTH,

Secretary.

(Enclosure)

RESOLUTION OF THE GARFIELD COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States at the 1st session of the 83d Congress a bill entitled "S. 1491," said bill having been introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, for himself and Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States at the 1st session of the 83d Congress, a bill entitled "H. R. 4023," said bill having been introduced by Mr. D'EWART, of Montana; and

Whereas both the aforementioned bills provide as follows, to wit: "To provide for the revision of the public lands laws in order to provide for orderly use, improvement, and development of the Federal lands and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the Federal range, and for other purposes"; and

Whereas the board of supervisors of the Garfield County Soil Conservation District of Garfield County, Mont., having reviewed said bills and after due and careful consideration by said board, it has been deduced that said bills are being introduced for the benefit of a few privileged individuals and not for the benefit of all the peoples of the United States; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America does not tolerate such special legislation; and

Whereas said board feels that said bills will in effect give away the property involved therein of the people of the United States, with a complete disregard for the rights of others and amount to what might be termed a legal steal for said privileged individuals and usurping the rights of the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas such legislation would give vested rights to certain privileged individuals in the Federal lands, which vested rights would practically amount to the deeding of said lands by Congress to said individuals, to be held by them perpetually for their own selfish use and not for the benefit of all; and

Whereas the United States of America was not founded on selfishness and greed, but grew on pillars of honesty and justice for all of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the Garfield County Soil Conservation District of Garfield County, Mont., now in special session, That it hereby goes on record against the aforementioned Senate bill 1491 and H. R. 4023, and that it desires the defeat of said legislation, for the reasons heretofore expressed in this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to Waters Davis, president of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, so that he may be informed of the views and expressions of this member district, so that said views and expressions may be presented to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the following Senators and Representatives of the State of Montana: Senator JAMES MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Representative LEE METCALF and Representative WESLEY D'EWART, so that they may be informed of said board's view and expressions, and they are hereby urged and requested to do all within their power to defeat said bills.

Dated this 15th day of May A. D. 1953.
GARFIELD COUNTY SOIL
CONSERVATION DISTRICT,
W. A. LARSON,

Chairman of the Board of Supervisors.
Attest:

MANUEL J. ROTH,
Secretary.

UNIVERSITY TEACHERS UNION,
LOCAL 497, AMERICAN
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Missoula, Mont., May 19, 1953.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: At its regular meeting on May 13 the University Teachers' Union, AFT, Local 497, voted unanimously to go on record as vigorously opposed to the passage of H. R. 4023 and its companion measure in the Senate, S. 1491.

In our opinion, these bills would seriously endanger the preservation of our land and forest resources. We believe their enactment would be decidedly detrimental to the best interests of all the people, and we, therefore, respectfully request that they be given an unfavorable report and that this letter be included in the testimony offered in hearing on the bills.

Very truly yours,
C. RULON JEPPESON,
President.
LUCILE SPEER,
Resolutions Committee.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 23, 1953.
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We concur most heartily in your action opposing grazing bill, H. R. 4023, as same would work a definite hardship on small-stockmen customers of ours.

GRAHAM & ROSS MERCANTILE CO.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 4, 1953.
Senator MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to inform you that as residents of Montana we are very much opposed to House bill 4023 and Senate bill 1491. These bills, in our opinion, are definitely detrimental to the best interest of all the people in our State. This letter may

be used as testimony at the hearings on these bills.

Yours sincerely,

Thomas W. Smith, Mrs. Thomas W. Smith, Kathleen Kramer, G. H. Fontaine, Roy C. Scharr, Earl S. Hooker, Violet M. Hooker, Selmer D. Clark, Barbara J. Clark, Roy A. La Motte, Mrs. R. A. La Motte, George A. Blyth, Jeannette A. Leigland, Mrs. Earl S. La Motte, E. S. La Motte, Anthony J. Lopuch, Edward R. Teddy, Elmer V. Teddy, A. H. Strong, Ralph S. Silta, Olaf M. Olson, Eric R. Flippen, Peggy Lee Blyth, S. A. Leigland.

INTEREST RATES AND INFLATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish to speak at some length on the question of interest rates and inflation.

From across the aisle in the past few weeks has come an intermittent drum-fire of criticism of one of the Eisenhower administration's steps toward establishing a sound fiscal policy for the United States. I refer to the repeated attacks which have been made against the Treasury Department's new issue of 3¼ percent 30-year bonds by some of our Democratic friends and also to the charge that it is a policy of the administration to raise interest rates. There is no such policy.

Some of this criticism may have been inspired by an honest misunderstanding of the factors which govern our monetary system. Much of it, we must conclude, has a political motive. It has become apparent that some of our opponents, with an eye on the 1954 elections, hope to use the interest-rate question as a basis for attacking the administration. It has been charged, for example, that the new Treasury bond issue is a part of what has been labeled a "takeaway" program. False slogans of that kind indicate that some of our opponents hope that if they shout black is white often enough and loud enough they can fool people into believing them.

Fortunately, the American people are rarely deceived when they have the facts, and I believe that when they know and understand the facts about this interest-rate question they will fully approve the President's program for giving the people of the United States a dollar they can count upon.

A sound dollar is one of the major goals of the Eisenhower administration, and is essential to its broad objectives of preserving our national security and strengthening our economy. The President stressed its importance in his radio report to the Nation on Wednesday, May 20, in this passage:

For every American family today, this matter of the sound dollar is crucial. Without a sound dollar, every American family would face a renewal of inflation, an ever-increasing cost of living, the withering away of savings and life-insurance policies.

Mr. President, a return to a sound dollar will not take away anything from the American people; far from it. Instead, it will give them a sound pension dollar; a sound life-insurance dollar. It will give them a full dollar of interest on Government bonds; a full dollar of savings for a home or for the future education of their children.

It will encourage and reward thrift in all its forms. Not only will the reward of savings be greater, but economic conditions favorable to long-range planning will once more be assured.

That is the meaning of the new policy of economic stability which the present administration has announced it will follow. That the meaning of the policy which the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System have already begun to put into effect; the Treasury by keeping hands off the money market, and taking it as they find it.

To understand why such a policy is necessary, we must remember what the Eisenhower administration inherited from its predecessors. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey well described that sorry legacy when, in his address at the Associated Press luncheon on April 20, he said:

For several years past we have been treading a dangerous path, one from which we have now turned. It is not too late to make the turn and avoid the inevitable consequences for which we were directly headed. For 20 years we have been consistently following unhealthy policies that induced inflation, depreciated our currency, and threatened to exhaust our credit. Over that period our dollar has shrunk from the hundred cents we started with to approximately 50 cents today. We have artificially manipulated our interest rates and have actually printed billions of dollars of current indebtedness which is only narrowly removed from printing money.

Mr. President, what has been the cost to the American people of these unhealthy policies of past administrations?

Ask the truly forgotten men and women who suffered because of inflation.

Ask those who had saved for a rainy day and found half their savings taken from their bank accounts by upward spiraling prices.

Ask those who had sacrificed to buy insurance for their families, only to find inflation slashing its value in half.

Ask those forced to live on fixed salaries, or upon salaries which always lagged behind the rise in prices—school-teachers, postal employees, government employees of all kinds, Federal, State, and municipal.

Ask the pensioned war veterans and those receiving social security benefits, which they paid for, in part, with their own money.

Ask the working men and women who found the pensions upon which they had been counting made inadequate by the ever-increasing cost of living.

Ask the universities, the schools, and hospitals, whose endowment funds lost half their purchasing power, to the extent that they had fixed-income security.

Ask the teachers in any level of education.

Mr. President, much has been said about the added interest cost, totaling some 7½ million dollars a year, which is involved in increasing the Treasury's rate on long-term bonds from 2½ to 3¼ percent. That cost is negligible when measured against the toll which has been stolen from everyone's pocket by a deliberate encouragement of inflation.

We probably never will be able to reckon the total cost, but the figures for

1 year alone will give us an inkling of its magnitude. In the recent report of the Banking and Currency Committee on Senate bill 1081, we find this statement:

The cost of inflation during fiscal 1951 to the Department of Defense alone was estimated at 7 billion dollars. The consumers of this country had to pay an estimated 18 to 20 billion dollars more for the goods and services they bought because of the price increases which took place between the outbreak of hostilities in Korea and the date of the issuance of the general ceiling price regulation on January 26, 1951.

Those were the costs, in one year alone, of a deliberate policy of inflation adopted by the former administration. Those were the staggering sums taken from the pockets of American taxpayers and consumers. Measured against them, I repeat, the increased cost of the new interest rate on long-term Treasury bonds is negligible. It is a small price to pay for a return to a sound fiscal policy which, in the end, will save the taxpayers and consumers much larger amounts.

Mr. President, I have regretted that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has not, up to the present time, entered into the current discussion of interest rates. In the 82d session of the Congress he made an important contribution to the understanding of monetary questions, interest rates, and the effects of inflation.

At that time there were differences of opinion between the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board about the policy then in effect of pegging the prices of Government bonds by open-market purchases.

There were then in the Senate those who were making statements similar to some of those made recently on the other side of the aisle.

What the Senator from Illinois said then, Mr. President, was so clear and convincing that I should like to quote portions of his remarks in the Senate on February 22, 1951.

First, let us hear from the Senator from Illinois on the effects of inflation:

What do we mean by inflation? To every housewife who goes to market it is painfully apparent in the rising cost of living. To every schoolteacher, to every Government worker, to millions living on retirement funds and countless millions more who are counting on their savings, to every individual who depends for existence on a fixed income, it brings up a nightmare of fear that the dwindling purchasing power of the dollar will put them on a starvation level. To the churches, to the universities, to millions investing in insurance, it is a living threat to their security. And what about the pensions which Congress has voted for those of our Armed Forces who have been wounded on the fighting fronts? What about payments of the pensions for which labor has fought so hard; and what about the social-security payments? These pension payments are in terms of fixed money amounts; and if prices go up and the value of the dollar goes down, the security which it was intended they would give becomes a mirage.

So spoke the Senator from Illinois in February 1951.

Further on in the RECORD, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said:

Every historian knows that inflation has been a great destroyer of the vast middle

classes, and of governments. It has paved the way for dictatorships and the overthrow of democratic institutions. By wiping out the middle classes and separating society into the two classes of the propertyless, on the one hand, and the rich speculators, on the other, it paved the way for fascism and communism on the continent of Europe. It is a destroyer almost as evil as war itself. In the eyes of those who want to destroy democracy and capitalistic institutions, it is a cheap way of achieving their collapse. It costs the enemy nothing in lives or treasure. It is really a supreme folly for a nation which is arming against the threat of invasion from without to let this invader, inflation, bring ruin from within.

Mr. President, I may say it is just as true as can be that with inflation the rich become richer, and the poor become poorer. That is one of the inevitable results of inflation. I should like to debate that point with anyone at any time.

Those were strong words which the Senator from Illinois spoke, and they should be a caution to those good friends of his across the aisle who attack the Eisenhower administration bitterly for doing just what the distinguished Senator from Illinois said must be done in fairness and justice to all the people, namely, the prevention of inflation.

Now let us hear from the Senator from Illinois as he described, in 1951, the Treasury's position under the former administration when the prior interest rate controversy was in progress:

Over the shoulder of the Federal Reserve System has stood the Treasury, making threatening passes and gestures and from time to time cracking its whip.

And what have been the Treasury's demands? They have insisted that the Reserve System hold its arms wide open and buy every Government security which is offered. They have insisted, moreover, that these securities shall be purchased above par—except in the case of some short-term issue—and shall be at low rates of interest—the actual coupon rate being $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent on outstanding long-term bonds.

Now, there are two assigned reasons why the Treasury insists upon this policy. The first is that they say the policy is necessary to prevent bonds from falling appreciably below par and hence bringing loss to those who hold them. The second reason is the saving to the Government in its interest payments. The total interest bill of the Government is now approximately \$5,800,000,000 a year. A rise of one-half percent in the interest rate would, it is claimed, cost the Government a billion and a quarter dollars a year more in interest charges.

Listen to the Senator from Illinois as he demolishes the arguments of the men who then controlled the Treasury:

These gentlemen [Democratic Treasury Secretaries] have been misguided men. For under the guise of keeping the interest rate down, they have forced the Reserve to action which resulted in increased bank credits and hence created inflation.

The costs to the Government and to the people have been far greater than the gains which we have made from a lower interest rate. The increase in prices since Korea are probably already adding to the Federal Government costs at the approximate rate of six billion a year.

The cost of meeting the interest on the public debt is now roughly \$5,800,000,000. The entire budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 1952 is approximately \$71,600,000,000. This means that Government expenditures for purposes other than interest, that is, for services and materials,

will be approximately \$66 billion. It is a conservative estimate that there has been a general increase in prices of commodities and services of roughly 10 percent as a result of the inflation; so that this inflationary price increase then is already costing the Government at least \$6 billion, and possibly more. That is in excess of the total amount which the Government now (1951) pays in interest.

Even if interest rates were doubled, which is at best a very remote possibility—

With which I agree—

the added cost of meeting the interest on the public debt would not equal the cost to the Government because of the rise in prices that has already taken place.

Furthermore, our whole society has been greatly disturbed and convulsed by the increase in the cost of living which has taken place; and no one knows what lies ahead.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois, distinguished economist that he is, displayed then an understanding of the necessity for a sound fiscal policy. I can only regret that he failed to convince some of his Democratic colleagues who are repeating now the arguments he exposed as utterly fallacious in 1951.

It has been contended that there is no longer danger of inflation; that what we now have to fear is deflation. However, all economic indicators point to the conclusion that we are still in a boom period. I have before me charts and data from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I have also before me charts from the Federal Reserve System, issued in April, containing economic indicators for May 1953. I also have the May letter on general business conditions of the National City Bank of New York. All of these documents indicate, as I have said, that we are in a boom period. Business activity is now at all-time high levels, and, generally speaking, nearly all industries are likewise enjoying great prosperity. That may not be true of all industries, but it is the showing of the general index. So, we are in a boom period.

Mr. President, we want no further inflation. We have seen too much of its damaging effects to fall into that error again. Neither do we want deflation. I read in last Sunday's newspaper about a politician who was discussing this issue. He said, "I am not for inflation, I am not for deflation. I am for 'flation.'" Mr. President, I submit that is about right.

What the Eisenhower administration wants to do—and is determined to do—is to safeguard the value of the dollar.

Mr. President, unfortunately, this is a somewhat technical subject. To understand why the new policy for a sound dollar is essential, we must understand the nature of our monetary system, and the effects upon it of Government financing. We should never forget those things, Mr. President, when we are talking about this very important and vital subject. Very simply, for a few moments, I shall try to deal with these matters. I admit the subject is very involved, and I shall therefore try not to go into it too deeply, but merely in a general way.

Since the close of the war the Government has done most of its financing by means of short-term note issues. Such securities are attractive primarily to commercial banks and to certain other

short-term investors. Their purchase by banks increases the money supply and thus puts upward pressure on prices and the cost of living. It is as simple as that.

In contrast, purchases of Government securities by long-term investors such as mutual savings banks, insurance companies, pension and trust funds, and so forth, tend to counteract the inflationary effects of Government borrowing. These institutions are the custodians of genuine savings. The funds which they put into Government securities and other types of investments can remain undisturbed for long periods of time. Indeed they are usually held to maturity.

In addition to relying almost entirely on short-term financing, the Government made it possible for investors who wished to do so to cash in their long-term holdings at any time without the risk of capital loss. Up to the time of the Treasury-Federal Reserve accord in 1951, the market was pegged. The peg was occasionally varied, but was never allowed to drop below par. At this figure, the Federal Reserve stood ready to buy all the bonds which investors might wish to sell.

The result was that long-term bonds no longer performed their unique function of contribution to economic stability. Instead they served about the same purpose as an equal amount of cash. Encouragement to inflationary spending could hardly have gone further.

It might be thought, in view of these policies, that the opportunities for long-term financing of the Government's needs during the postwar period were limited. But on the contrary, such opportunities were ample. Savings were accumulating. But they were not going into Government securities. Why? Because other borrowers were offering more attractive rates of return on obligations with a sound investment appeal.

To compete for loan funds, the Government would have had to raise interest rates—which it was unwilling to do. It would have had to meet the first test of pricing in a free market, namely, payment of the going rate. During the entire period between the close of World War II and the end of the Truman administration, the Treasury did not offer a single long-term marketable issue in either new borrowing or refunding operations. Small amounts of investment-type nonmarketable bonds were occasionally offered, and savings bond sales to individuals were promoted. But a large part of the increase in savings bonds over this period was due to the accumulation of interest. New investments of this type were not very attractive at a time when the dollar was rapidly depreciating.

It is true that the interest cost of the public debt during this period was smaller than it would have been if the Treasury had gone into the market and competed for investment funds on a price basis. Had it done so, it may be noted that the increased interest cost would have been partly recovered in taxation. Moreover, to the extent that the interest on Government bonds went to insurance companies, savings banks, pension funds, and other forms of the

people's savings it would have benefited the millions of families who were being most damaged by inflation and by inadequate returns on their savings funds.

I might say, parenthetically, Mr. President, that it is time the thrifty individual, who is more responsible for the development of this country than is anyone else, came into his own again. We have been glorifying the borrower for the past 20 years, and I think we are now paying through the nose because of that policy. I believe the policy of the administration to which I referred, namely, a policy which will bring the saver back into his own and stop the hidden thief, inflation, is the policy which should be followed.

It is the intention of the present administration in conducting its financing operations to allow the forces of competition, and the price mechanism through which they work, to have the fullest scope consistent with the national well being. This is the meaning of a free market. It is an essential step in restoring the independence of the Federal Reserve System and enabling it once more to use monetary policy in the best interests of the country as a whole.

Competition for funds is strong at the present time, when the Treasury must raise new money to cover expenditures in excess of revenues. State and local borrowing this calendar year will probably approach the 1952 total of more than \$7½ billion. Urban home credit will probably increase by another \$6 billion this year; and consumer instalment credit—especially automobile credit—is currently expanding at a very high rate.

With active bidding in the investment markets, the Treasury cannot hope to obtain any significant share of investment funds unless it offers an interest rate and other terms which are judged adequate by those who have money to lend. The fact that the new 3¼-percent bond has been selling close to par since trading on this issue began is evidence that the Treasury priced its new security about right, in view of the market, in order to get the desired amount of funds from long-term investors.

Mr. President, incidentally, there has been some criticism with reference to the way that issue was handled. I say that events have proved that the Treasury was correct. The speculators, those who oversubscribed the bonds to bring the total subscription up to approximately \$5 billion, about which we have heard so much from across the aisle, were prepared to borrow 10 times as much money as they needed to buy the bonds because they thought they could make a quarter of a percent out of them, or possibly a little more than that. What they found out was that the Treasury was right and they were wrong in their guess. They unloaded rapidly, and that brought the issue down below par. But I have noticed that lately the issue is going back. The last quotation I saw was 99¾, which is practically par. So, Mr. President, I consider that the issue was a success. There is nothing about it for which to apologize, except with reference to the behavior of the speculators, who, from time to time, think it is wise to trade against their own Government, a practice which I thoroughly disapprove

and which I think should be generally condemned.

However we may look at it, the fundamental question involved in our program for a return to sound money is actually very simple. For some time the Government will be running a deficit; taxes will not be sufficient to cover all our Government expenditures because of the situation we have inherited from the Truman administration. Do we as a people want to meet these requirements out of genuine savings, paid for at competitive market rates? Or do we want to continue the process of keeping a large portion of the debt in short-term issues, with all that that implies for the encouragement of inflationary pressures?

The American people gave their answer to that, along with some other questions, last November. They voted to protect the value of their savings.

There is only one way the present administration can fulfill the monetary responsibilities which the voters gave it last year. That is courageously to take whatever steps are necessary and within their authority to maintain the present balance between inflation and deflation—to balance the budget, and to safeguard the value of the dollar.

It is worth noting that the policies now being followed by this administration with respect to money, credit, and debt management are not new policies. A flexible monetary policy, capable of meeting both inflationary and deflationary threats, was one of the purposes for which the Federal Reserve System was created 40 years ago. By whom? By Carter Glass, distinguished Democratic Senator and Secretary of the Treasury. Under whom? Woodrow Wilson, a Democratic President.

Mr. President, I want to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that those two gentlemen would roll in their graves if they heard some of the statements which have been made on this floor by members of their own party.

It is a policy which has had the overwhelming support of specialists in the field of monetary, credit, and debt management policies throughout those 40 years. A rigid interest-rate structure, supported by artificial means, is the policy which is new. It was undertaken during World War II, supposedly to meet special war circumstances. It was continued after the war, when these circumstances were no longer present—with the disastrous results with which we are all familiar, and for which we shall continue to pay for a long time to come.

The dangers inherent in artificially low interest rates, and the need for a return to free markets, were given strong expression by the committees of the Congress who have been charged with investigations of these matters in recent years.

In January 1950, for example, the Subcommittee on Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], whom I have previously quoted, made the following recommendation on monetary policy:

We recommend that an appropriate, flexible, and vigorous monetary policy, employed

in coordination with fiscal and other policies, should be one of the principal methods used to achieve the purposes of the Employment Act. Timely flexibility toward easy credit at some times and credit restrictions at other times is an essential characteristic of a monetary policy that will promote economic stability rather than instability. The vigorous use of a restrictive monetary policy as an anti-inflation measure has been inhibited since the war by considerations relating to holding down the yields and supporting the prices of United States Government securities. As a long-run matter, we favor interest rates as low as they can be without inducing inflation, for low interest rates stimulate capital investment. But we believe that the advantages of avoiding inflation are so great and that a restrictive monetary policy can contribute so much to this end that the freedom of the Federal Reserve to restrict credit and raise interest rates for general stabilization purposes should be restored even if the cost should prove to be a significant increase in service charges on the Federal debt and a greater inconvenience to the Treasury in its sale of securities for new financing and refunding purposes.

In another section of its report the committee further stressed the importance of a return to free markets as follows:

Another reason for preferring reliance on monetary, credit, and fiscal policies as the major method of general economic stabilization is that they are more consistent with the maintenance of our democratic system and with the fostering and promotion of free competitive enterprise. These instruments do not involve the Government in detailed control of the particulars of the economy; they do not require the Government to intervene in individual transactions between buyer and seller, in dealings between employer and employee, and in the determination of the prices and production of particular commodities. These millions of intricate decisions are left to the operation of the market mechanism while general monetary, credit, and fiscal policies work toward stabilization by influencing the total supply and cost of money and the total amount of money income at the disposal of the private sectors of the economy. There is every difference between the effects of general overall monetary, credit, and fiscal policies which indirectly influence the economy toward stabilization and the effects of an elaborate system of direct controls.

In June of last year, another subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management, under the chairmanship of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN—reported that it saw no reason to alter the general recommendation on money and credit policies made in January 1950 by its predecessor committee. The majority report was not particularly critical of the policies then in effect, however, and for that reason the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in a minority statement, made a strong attack on the policy whereby Government securities could be turned into cash at any time without risk of capital loss. He urged, in particular, that stability of price levels was far more important to the social and economic well-being of the country than any artificially maintained stability of the interest rate.

I have heard the criticism made lately that there is no need now for higher interest rates and tighter credit since prices are not now rising. It is said also

that high rates and tighter credit will bring hardships. People who want to borrow money, it is said, will have to pay more for it, and may find it harder to get.

It is perfectly true that a flexible monetary policy operates sometimes to tighten credit—to make it harder for people to borrow—when there is danger of inflationary developments, just as it acts to ease credit when a stimulus to business activity is needed. It is also true that many prices are not rising now. But with business and trade operating at close to capacity, as at present, the simple fact is that we cannot keep prices under control if we continue to supply credit in almost unlimited amounts at artificially low interest rates. That is the real heart of the matter. A stable price structure which safeguards the value of the dollar is worth very much more to the veteran, the home buyer, the farmer, the small businessman, the consumer, than the additional price which he may have to pay for borrowed funds.

Moreover, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that the time to prevent an inflationary price rise is before it starts—not after it is under way. Because of heavy tax payment months, the Government in the present half of this calendar year is taking in more money than it has been paying out. This is helping to keep the money supply in balance with the needs of the economy. But the opposite will be true in the second half of the year. We will then be taking in considerably less than we will be paying out.

We cannot ignore this deficit. The Treasury has to borrow money to cover it. Continued rapid expansion of private credit, combined with more Government borrowing, could easily put us right back on the road to inflation again. Interest rates have an important role to play in helping to keep this from happening. Their function is lost—and monetary policy rendered ineffective—when they are kept below the level which would permit them to contribute to the stability of the economy.

No one of us needs to fear that stability cannot be maintained—or that the prosperity of the country depends on continually increasing Government spending, financed in part by inflationary borrowings. In the words of the Secretary of the Treasury, speaking before the members of the Associated Press on April 20:

Peace is what we all want. It is nothing to fear, nor is there any reason for depression. Adjustments, yes. But not depression. So long as we maintain the soundness of our money; attain that nice balance between achieving security from aggression and maintaining economic strength; eliminate waste and handle our fiscal affairs with wisdom, America can look forward to good jobs at good pay and real advances in our scale of living. We can have a stronger economy based on sounder fundamental conditions and with greater opportunity for individual and collective future security than we have known in many years.

Mr. President, I gladly subscribe to those statements by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The monetary and debt management policies now being pursued represent only a part of the broad program for getting our American economy back on

a sound basis. But they are an essential element in this program, and one which every citizen can understand in terms of his own income, his own savings, and his own individual plans for the future. These policies are important to him for those reasons.

In closing, let me repeat there is no policy to increase interest rates. The policy is to have a stable dollar, a sound dollar for all the workers and savers of America. With a sound dollar interest rates may fluctuate up and down, but no one will be hurt if the value of the dollar remains stable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I very gladly yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wish to extend my congratulations to the Senator from Connecticut on the superb address he has just made.

Mr. BUSH. I very deeply appreciate the Senator's compliment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for his excellent presentation of the subject covered in his address, which is seemingly a controversial problem, but which should not be. I believe every American citizen is interested in the stability of the dollar. For the past 15 or 20 years there has been the threat of inflationary pressure, which has wiped out much of the earnings of our people.

I know of the Senator's long experience in the financial field. His understanding and presentation go a long way toward clarifying the issues presented by the present policy of the Treasury and of the freedom that has been given to the Federal Reserve Board to protect the value of the United States dollar.

As I understand, the opposite philosophy is that we shall meet inflation by direct Government controls, which are never effective, but are a political approach to the solution of an economic problem which ought to be solved by action of the Federal Reserve.

Does the Senator from Connecticut agree with me that this inflationary pressure began, in the first instance, with the devaluation of the dollar, when the United States went off the gold standard, and, following that, by a decrease in the rediscount rates and in the bank reserve requirements; and that the most destructive policy of all was the open market purchasing by the Federal Reserve Board at a pegged price?

Mr. BUSH. I agree with the Senator's statement that that was a very important feature of the program that began the inflationary process, especially in the monetary field. Of course, the failure to balance the budget later became a very important factor.

Mr. BRICKER. Likewise, with reference to the issuance of short-term Government notes, is it not true that for every dollar of short-term money the Government borrowed, there was pumped into the credit and currency stream of the country between \$5 and \$6?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is correct; there was that effect.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, that continually raised prices that the people had to pay.

Mr. BUSH. It continually increased the supply of money without enlarging the supply of goods. Increasing the supply of money but leaving the supply of goods the same obviously had an inflationary effect.

Mr. BRICKER. The increased cost of living for the people of the United States was an inevitable consequence of the fiscal policy the Government carried out.

Mr. BUSH. It could not possibly have been otherwise. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BRICKER. The only question we face is whether we shall have a sound dollar, or shall continue to have a program of greenbackism, which has been threatening the credit of the Nation.

Mr. BUSH. There can be no question at all about that. I do not believe the people of the United States, once they understand the issue, will stand for greenbackism. I think they are solidly behind the administration in its effort to create a sound dollar, and they will support that program. Furthermore, I believe that all Members of Congress who support it will be supported by the people.

Mr. BRICKER. I am quite confident the Senator is correct. There has been no depreciation in the value of some fifty-nine or sixty billion dollars of savings bonds held by people who loaned their money in an effort to win the war. There has been no decrease in the value of those bonds.

Mr. BUSH. I will not agree with the Senator about that. I think they have had some depreciation. The value of the money that was invested in savings bonds during the early part of the war is not the same as it is now.

Mr. BRICKER. But that is the result of inflation; it is not the result of present fiscal policy.

Mr. BUSH. It is the result of inflation.

Mr. BRICKER. There is no deflation in the market price of those bonds; is there?

Mr. BUSH. No; but there was no open market in those bonds. There was one agreed price all the time. One could cash his bonds from year to year at a price fixed well in advance.

Mr. BRICKER. The only loss to holders of those bonds was by reason of inflation. Inflation has lessened the value of the return on those bonds.

Mr. BUSH. But the Senator will agree with me that it was a very important loss; will he not?

Mr. BRICKER. It was just as important as was any savings account loss to the American people in the inflationary period. Those who had insurance policies and savings accounts in banks and building and loan associations have suffered approximately 60 times the total loss to depositors and stockholders in banks and building and loan associations during the 1932 failures.

Mr. BUSH. I will accept the Senator's statement. I cannot verify it.

Mr. BRICKER. That is, measured in purchasing power of the dollar.

I again commend the Senator for his presentation. He will have much support.

Mr. BUSH. I am very grateful to the Senator from Ohio for helping to develop this subject, and for his very generous remarks.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I gladly yield to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to take this occasion to congratulate my personal friend, the great statesman sent to the Senate by the people of Connecticut, and in turn, to congratulate the people of Connecticut for sending such an able, profound statesman to this body.

It is wholesome and inspiring to listen to a Senator of his stature deliver the profound speech we have just heard. When we consider the character, integrity, and ability of the Senator from Connecticut, who has presented his thesis to us today, we need have little fear for the future of this country. I congratulate the Senator on his remarks.

Mr. BUSH. I thank my friend from Idaho very deeply and sincerely for his too generous remarks. I want him to know that I appreciate his taking the trouble to make them. I hope I may prove worthy of them.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. PURTELL. I join other Senators in complimenting my colleague from Connecticut for doing a piece of work which needed to be done. Our people have been misinformed about the whole subject of interest. On behalf of the people of Connecticut and the people of the entire country, I thank my colleague for presenting to the Senate and to the people of the Nation the truth about the subject of interest. We owe my colleague a great debt for doing the job he has done.

Mr. BUSH. I am most grateful to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut for his generous remarks. I appreciate them very much indeed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am delighted to yield to my friend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. I commend the Senator from Connecticut for the magnificent statement he has made today. I hope his statement will be widely read by the people of the United States. What they need now is the truth. Many are evading the truth. Those who are being injured by the inflation which we now have are the folks with savings accounts, the veterans who are drawing pensions, and the men and women on social security. They are the ones who are losing. Is not that true?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not also true that the businessman who wants to speculate is the man who wins by inflation?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the inflationary times through which we have passed have been wonderful for the speculators. They have done well. I

suspect that that fact has been partly responsible for the reluctance of some very wealthy people and speculators to fight inflation, because they have done very well under it. At some future time I should like to develop that point, because, as I have often said, under inflation the rich become richer and the poor become poorer. Under inflation the value of the things one owns goes up, whereas the man who does not own any property does not enjoy the benefit of any increase in value. However, the cost of living goes up, and his income remains the same. Moreover, as the value of the property, securities, or real estate which the individual owns goes up, his income from such property also goes up, and he is far better off under a 5 or 10 percent inflation than is the poor fellow who owns no property, and who is lucky if he obtains a raise after the inflation. That is why the rich become richer and the poor become poorer.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I sincerely trust that at some time in the very near future, the distinguished and able Senator from Connecticut will develop the subject upon which he has just spoken. It is essential for the people of the United States to understand that we cannot remain solvent unless our dollar is sound.

If the Senator will permit me, I should like to give an illustration of what inflation means. A farmer in my own county came to me not long ago and said: "I should like to give you an illustration of what inflation has done to me. Ten years ago I bought \$1,000 worth of savings bonds. The other day I cashed them and got my \$1,000. They cost me \$750. At the time I bought those savings bonds I could have bought a Ford car or a Chevrolet car. However, now, with my \$1,000 I could not buy half a car."

Does not the Senator agree that that is a very good illustration of the situation?

Mr. BUSH. It is a very good illustration. An additional factor is that he was supposed to be getting a return on his money. However, the inflation was so great that the return withered with the capital. The Senator is absolutely correct. I am most grateful for his assistance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor unless there are some questions.

Mr. CARLSON obtained the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXEMPTION FROM ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose of House bill 4654 is to settle a number of issues relating to the annual leave rights of and lump-sum payments for unused annual leave to employees in the executive branch of the Government. The bill deals not only with certain matters that have caused many of us great concern during recent weeks but, in addition, it contains provisions that will enable the heads of departments and agencies to adopt more economical and efficient practices in the scheduling of work assignments and vacation periods throughout the Federal service.

The bill accomplishes the following major objectives:

First. It removes high officials in the executive branch of the Government from the leave system applicable to Federal employees generally.

Second. It ends the granting of lump-sum payments to such exempted officials covering periods of service in the future.

Third. It settles two basic questions: First, which officers are entitled to the compensation attached to their office by virtue of their status as officers and, second, which officers are required to conform to the regular statutes and regulations governing hours of work and leaves of absence.

Fourth. It restores the annual leave accumulation provisions of the 1951 Leave Act by repealing section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953—Public Law 455, 82d Congress.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to explain in some little detail the background and importance of each of the four major objectives of this bill.

First, the removal of certain high officials from the leave system applicable to Federal employees generally.

The granting of leave of absence with pay to employees of the Government goes back to the act of March 3, 1893. From then until the act of March 14, 1936, with the exception of a temporary economy act, the statutes provided in substance that the head of a department might grant 30 days' annual leave with pay to each clerk or employee.

It was not until the act of 1936 that the right of officers, as distinguished from employees, to earn and accrue annual leave was established. The 1936 act, in pertinent part, provided that—

All civilian officers and employees of the United States wherever stationed and of the District of Columbia, regardless of their tenure, in addition to any accrued leave, shall be entitled to 26 days' annual leave with pay each calendar year, exclusive of Sundays and holidays.

Subsequent to enactment of the 1936 act, the Comptroller General was asked for a decision as to whether the act was applicable to the Administrator, Wage

and Hour Division, Department of Labor, who had been appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Comptroller General on the basis of the language of the act and in the absence of any indication in the legislative history of the act that it was not intended to apply to Cabinet officers, agency heads, or other appointive officials held in a decision rendered on November 14, 1939, that the official in question, being a civilian official of the United States and not expressly excepted from the terms of the statute, was entitled to annual leave with pay under the terms of the 1936 act.

Although under this act civilian officers and employees were entitled to earn and accrue unused leave, upon the termination of their services the accrued leave to the credit of such officials and employees could not be liquidated in a lump sum. Consequently, such officials and employees were carried on the payroll in a leave status until the expiration of their accrued leave and then terminated.

By the act of December 21, 1944, Congress provided for the liquidation of accumulated and accrued annual leave due an officer or employee upon separation from the service in a lump sum.

The reason for the enactment of the 1944 act as set forth in reports of the committees on civil service of the Senate and House are, in part, as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize a lump-sum payment for accumulated annual or vacation leave due any officer or employee of the Government when separated from the Government (or in the event of death).

At the present time there is no authority in law to pay an employee in money for such leave as may be due him upon separation from the service. In order to receive the benefits of accumulated leave prior to separation from the service, the date of separation must be fixed at the expiration of such leave. Employees who are to be separated from the service therefore, must be carried on the payroll as nominal employees until they have received salary for the period covered by the accumulated leave.

The reports of the Senate and House Committees on Civil Service in connection with the 1944 Lump-Sum Act then state:

This bill would provide many benefits such as the problem of dual compensation; stop service credit on the last day of active duty; permit immediate recruitment of a successor to a separated employee; would make fund available to employees leaving the services after the war enabling them to return to their homes; would simplify and expedite clearance of records in closing out installations; would eliminate considerable paperwork for payroll sections, and would save expenses to the Government.

After the 1944 act became law, the Comptroller General, in response to a question raised by the Federal Communications Commission with regard to the leave rights of a Commissioner, held as follows:

The Annual Leave Act of March 14, 1936, is applicable to all civilian officers and employees of the United States, with certain exceptions not here material. Also, the act of December 21, 1944, is applicable to any civilian officer or employee of the United

States who is entitled to receive leave of absence with pay. Therefore, a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, who is a civilian officer of the United States, clearly comes within the purview of both statutes.

In 1951 the leave laws applicable to civilian officers and employees were revised by enactment of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

The provisions of the 1951 act, like the provisions of the 1936 Leave Act and the 1944 Lump-Sum Act, apply to Cabinet members, agency heads, and other officials as well as employees.

That, in brief, is the history of the leave and lump-sum rights of civilian officers and employees in the Federal service.

The disclosure recently that 215 high officials of the Government who left the service during the period November 1, 1952, to February 15, 1953, received lump-sum payments aggregating over \$700,000 on account of annual leave remaining to their credit indicated the need for reconsideration of the issues involved.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I have the honor to be chairman, is unanimous of the view that a formal leave system and the right to lump-sum payments on account of any unused leave growing out of such a system is not appropriate in the case of top-ranking officials in the Government. This conclusion is based on the premise that such officials can never divest themselves of their responsibilities even during periods of vacation or illness. In effect such officials are on duty at all times; thus, it is absurd, in the case of these officials, to pretend that attendance and leave records can be maintained and then allow them lump-sum payments for unused annual leave remaining to their credit when they leave such positions.

As indicated earlier this bill has four major objectives, the first of which is the removal of certain high officials from the leave system applicable to Federal employees generally.

Section 1 of the bill accomplishes this objective by removing from the Sick and Annual Leave Act of 1951, the following:

First. All Presidential appointees in the executive branch whose ratio of basic compensation exceeds the maximum of grade GS-18—presently \$14,800.

Second. All chiefs of mission in the Foreign Service and officers of similar rank in other agencies who are paid in accordance with the provisions of section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946—\$15,000 to \$25,000 a year.

Third. Other officers that may be specifically designated by the President except postmasters, United States attorneys, or United States marshals.

There are approximately 225 Presidential appointees who will be exempted from the 1951 Leave Act under the first provision referred to above. There are between 70 and 80 chiefs of mission in the Foreign Service and between 15 and 25 comparable rank officers in other agencies—principally in the Mutual Security Administration—who will be exempted from the leave act under the second provision. Under the third provision

the President has the authority—except with respect to postmasters, United States attorneys, and United States marshals—to remove from the 1951 Leave Act such other officers as he may designate. It has been indicated by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission speaking on behalf of the President that a permissive provision of this kind is advisable and necessary to bring about the exclusion of officials comparable to those specifically exempted such as the Treasurer of the United States, the civilian Commissioners of the District of Columbia, etc. It is estimated that the number of officers designated by the President will number less than a hundred. Thus, in total, the bill removes the 400 to 500 top officials of the Government from the leave act.

As indicated, the second major objective of the bill is to end the entitlement of high officials to lump-sum payments covering periods of service in the future.

This objective is accomplished by exempting such officials from coverage under the 1951 Leave Act. By terminating their right to annual leave, they automatically lose any rights to lump-sum payments covering periods of future service.

The third major objective of the bill is the settlement of two basic questions: First, which officers are entitled to the compensation attached to their office by virtue of their status as officers. Second, which officers are required to conform to the regular statutes and regulations governing hours of work and leaves of absence.

Section 1 of the bill settles both of these questions. Officers who are exempted from the act would retain their present right to absent themselves from duty as they see fit but they would lose the present unwarranted added right to leave benefits and lump-sum payments. On the other hand, officers who are not exempted from the Leave Act would lose their freedom with respect to hours of work but would retain their statutory rights to annual leave and lump-sum payments for any such unused leave upon separation from the service.

The fourth and final major objective of the bill is the restoration of the leave accumulation provisions of the 1951 Leave Act. Those provisions permit a maximum accumulation of 60 days' annual leave by employees in the United States and 90 days by overseas employees with minor exceptions.

The committee firmly believes that as a general rule, agencies should restrict the accumulation of annual leave by seeing to it that employees take regularly scheduled vacations. However, a reasonable amount of flexibility in the use and accumulation of annual leave is desirable for a number of reasons:

First. The committee is convinced, on the basis of testimony by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and others, that the restriction on accumulations of annual leave is costly and unduly burdensome to administer. It is costly because (a) under certain circumstances when employees are forced to take time off or lose certain benefits to which they are entitled their work is

done by others on an overtime basis, at overtime rates of pay; (b) it is necessary for agencies to maintain dual records on each employee which increases overhead; (c) its effect is reflected in higher turnover and lower employee morale.

Second. During emergencies or rush periods it may be advantageous to the Government to restrict the use of leave on a partial or total basis within an agency or even throughout the Federal service as a whole. Under these conditions, if leave cannot be accumulated, administrative officials must either force employees to lose earned leave or must grant leave, which results in loss of production, and may require work by other employees at overtime rates of pay.

Third. Employees earn only 13 days annual leave during each of the first 3 years of their employment. During the 4th through the 15th years, they earn 20 days per year, and thereafter 26 days per year. Not all of this time is available for vacation purposes, for the reason that every absence from duty for any reason is charged to the employee's leave account. As a result many employees, particularly the newer ones, find it difficult and financially prohibitive to return to their homes for their vacations on the amount of annual leave earned and remaining to their credit during any given year.

Fourth. Federal employees, unlike most employees in private employment, are not covered by the Federal unemployment-insurance program. The only financial protection against unemployment Federal employees have is the accumulated annual leave standing to their credit.

Fifth. The June 30 deadline date in the Thomas amendment precedes the normal summer vacation period. Thus, to avoid the forfeiture of earned leave, employees are compelled to schedule vacations at a time that is disadvantageous to the agency where they are employed because it causes an excess of leave-taking during the closing weeks of the fiscal year, when the workload is often at its peak.

Sixth. Another factor, and one not without considerable significance, is the 1951 Leave Act itself. This act has been in effect only a little over a year—since January 6, 1952, to be specific. Under its terms the vast majority of Federal employees received a drastic cut-back in the amount of annual and sick leave earned each year. Sick leave was cut from 15 to 13 days a year. Annual leave was reduced as follows:

(a) Employees appointed for less than 90 days, reduced from 2½ days a month to no leave at all.

(b) Employees with less than 3 years service, reduced from 26 days to 13 days a year.

(c) Employees with 3 but less than 15 years' service, reduced from 26 days to 20 days a year.

(d) Employees with over 15 years' service—no change.

These cuts as voted by the Senate in 1951, reduced the leave earnings of the 2¼ million Federal employees by 15,630,000 days, having a salary value of over \$275 million. Worded in another way, Federal employees were required to

work 15 million days more, under the 1951 Leave Act, than they would have worked, had that act not been enacted. That measure was passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives. I wanted the Senate and the country to know that because of that Leave Act, the employees contributed \$275 million worth of work the Government would not have received if that act had not been changed by Congress.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee believes that the reduced rate of leave earnings under the 1951 Leave Act is fair both to the employees and to the Government. It does believe, however, that a further restriction, such as that provided in the Thomas amendment, is neither necessary nor advisable.

In summary, on this point, repeal of section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, and restoration of the accumulation provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 would (a) enable agencies to adopt more efficient work schedules and economical practices in the granting of leaves of absence, (b) enable employees to take reasonable vacations during the normal vacation season, (c) enable employees to establish a small amount of self-provided protection in the event of sudden unemployment through no fault of their own.

In connection with the four major objectives I have covered, the bill contains the following necessary technical provisions to assure that they are carried out as intended:

Subsection (s) of section 1 enables the President to authorize leaves of absence to chiefs of mission in the foreign service and comparable officers for use in the United States, its Territories and possessions. Under the 1951 Leave Act, such officers receive, in addition to annual and sick leave, home leave at the rate of 1 week for each 4 months' service abroad. Such home leave is not in the same category as annual leave, in that it must be used for that purpose only either during one or between two assignments abroad, and when it is not used, it cannot serve as the basis for any lump-sum payment. When such officers are removed from the 1951 Leave Act, they will lose their entitlement not only to annual and sick leave, but also to home leave. It is not necessary to provide them with annual and sick leave, because as officers they have freedom to absent themselves from duty. It is necessary, however, to provide statutory leaves of absence for use in the United States, its Territories and possessions, so that their travel cost can continue to be paid in the future, as at present.

Section 2 of the bill suspends the entitlement of officers taken out from under the 1951 Leave Act, as a result of enactment of the bill, to liquidation, by lump-sum payment at the time of or during their exemption from the act, of any leave to which they are entitled immediately prior to their exemption.

Such leave will remain frozen to the credit of the officer until first, he is separated from the service, in which case it will be liquidated at the rate of compensation he was receiving at the time of his exemption from the Leave Act;

or second, he transfers to a position subject to the Leave Act, in which case it will be recredited to him.

Finally, the bill contains a perfecting change to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

The 1951 Leave Act provides that employees may not have more than specified amounts of annual leave to their credit at the end of the last pay period occurring in the year. The end of the last pay period may occur on any date from December 20—as happened last year—to the end of the month. When it occurs before Christmas, some employees are forced to forfeit leave they might otherwise use over the Christmas and New Year's holidays. This can be overcome by correcting the 1951 Leave Act to provide that employees may not have more than specified amounts of annual leave to their credit at the beginning of the first pay period occurring in the year. This management of the leave year will permit the use of unused accrued leave over the holidays, while maintaining the advantages of pay-period accounting.

The committee believes that enactment of the bill as reported is highly desirable in the interest of economy and good management.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the bill will be passed.

My colleagues will notice that various amendments are submitted to the bill, which is a House measure, and deals with only one subject. In the amendments we provide for the various changes.

So, Mr. President, I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is there in the bill any provision to prohibit the so-called firing-and-rehiring racket which was recently exposed—a plan whereby employees were being separated from the service and were paid for their annual leave, and then were being immediately reemployed, without forfeiting their annual leave?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; there is. We think we have in the bill adequate provisions on that point, and we also feel that the General Accounting Office has made some very definite rulings on this particular phase of the matter. The distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the former chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, placed in the RECORD earlier this year, I believe, some correspondence he had on that subject with the General Accounting Office.

As a committee, we felt that the matter was well taken care of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield further?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No doubt the Senator from Kansas is familiar with the amendment I offered a few days ago to one of the appropriation bills. That amendment provided that in the event an employee was separated from the service and received a lump-sum payment for his annual leave, and then was reemployed before the period covered by his annual leave had expired, he would

be required to pay into the Treasury an amount equal to the unexpired portion of his annual leave.

Would the chairman of the committee accept an amendment which would prohibit that practice? I do not believe it is fully corrected in the bill as it now stands. I am sure the committee agrees with me that Congress never intended to endorse this practice when we passed the original law.

Mr. CARLSON. Our committee discussed that matter at some length. Personally, I am in accord with what the Senator from Delaware desires to do. If he believes that we have not taken care of the matter in this bill—and I certainly wish to take care of it—then I would not have objection, personally, to accepting his amendment and taking it to conference, with the distinct understanding that I am not familiar with the language of the amendment, although I am familiar with the principle he is trying to apply, with which I am in accord.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me ask the Senator from Delaware what the amendment will do? Will it change the amount of leave Federal employees have already accumulated?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment was prepared by the Legislative Counsel, and I think it accomplishes its purpose outlined but, if in conference it is found that a rewording of the amendment is needed, I would not object.

The purpose of the amendment is that in the event individual employees or a group of employees are separated from the service and receive lump-sum payments for their annual leave, and if, for example, they had 60 days annual leave coming to them, they are reemployed by the Government within the 60-day period, then to the extent that the 60-day period had not expired, they would pay back into the Treasury the amount represented by the unexpired portion.

This will prevent a repetition of the case which occurred in the Rent Stabilization Agency, where employees were fired wholesale on Saturday night, and were reemployed on Monday morning, but in the meantime had received lump-sum payments for their accumulated annual leave.

If my amendment is adopted, and a similar incident occurs these employees could be reemployed only after they returned to the Treasury the lump-sum payments they had received for their accumulated annual leave—which I think such employees should do.

I repeat, the amendment merely provides that employees cannot draw their annual-leave payments and keep on working for the Federal Government.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as I have stated, personally I am in accord with what the Senator from Delaware is trying to do. I have had discussions with the General Accounting Office, which, after having studied the bill, has advised me that it would be glad to write

a letter to the effect that the bill does take care of the matter.

As I say, I shall be willing to take the amendment to conference, where the proposal will be worked out with the conferees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement about the matter with which the Senator from Delaware dealt a few months ago.

I was interested in it, and I wrote to the Comptroller General of the United States, asking for a modification of the former ruling. In reply, the Comptroller General advised that, having inquired into the matter further, a ruling had been made which prohibits the very thing to which the Senator from Delaware referred a few moments ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that is correct, but, according to my information, there is still this situation: A man can be reemployed in a different position, under a different annual-leave system. For example, if he is presently holding a position as a permanent employee, and is transferred into temporary status, he would be under a different leave system. Temporary employees have a different leave system than that of permanent employees. There is therefore a question in the minds of some of those in the Comptroller General's Office as to whether the modified rule corrects that situation. Again I say the amendment would merely accomplish what we are all trying to do, and what the Comptroller General says must be done. I think it would afford an additional safeguard.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think that was true until the Comptroller General made his last ruling, which, in a way, changed his former ruling. The last ruling will, I think, take care of the situation about which the Senator from Delaware has complained. I base my statement upon the letter of the Comptroller General to me and also upon the order which he enclosed therewith.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps that is true. But if we adopt this amendment we will preclude any possible chance that some future Comptroller General will reverse that interpretation and return to the old interpretation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator from Delaware about that.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from South Carolina agree that we might take this amendment to conference?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it might be well to take it to conference. If it is found in conference that there is any question of its constitutionality—a question which might be raised by the attorneys—of course, I know that the Senator from Delaware would not further insist upon it, or would modify the amendment in order to take care of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment which is in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 202 of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by adding a subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) (1) This title shall not apply to the following officers in the executive branch of the Government: (a) persons appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone, whose rates of basic compensation exceed the maximum rate provided in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; (b) persons who receive compensation at one of the rates authorized in section 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; and (c) such other officers (except postmasters, United States attorneys, and United States marshals) as may be designated by the President. No officer in the executive branch to whom this title applies shall be deemed to be entitled to the compensation attached to his office solely by virtue of his status as an officer.

"(2) The President, in his discretion, may authorize leaves of absence to persons who are exempted from this title pursuant to subsection (c) (1) (b) for use in the United States and its Territories and possessions."

SEC. 2. (a) The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which any officer exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as a result of the enactment of this act is entitled immediately prior to the date this act becomes applicable to him shall be liquidated by a lump-sum payment at the rate of compensation which he was receiving immediately prior to such date only upon (1) the separation of such officer from the service, (2) the death of such officer, or (3) the transfer of such officer to a position under a leave system other than the leave system provided by the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

(b) In the event any such exempted officer, without any break in the continuity of his service, again becomes subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 upon the completion of his service as an exempted officer, such officer shall be credited with the unused annual and sick leave standing to his credit at the time he was exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

(c) In the event any such exempted officer is separated from the service to enter upon active service in the Armed Forces or the merchant marine of the United States, such officer shall be entitled (1) to receive compensation covering the accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which he is entitled immediately prior to the date this act becomes applicable to him, or (2) to elect to have such leave remain to his credit until his return from active service in the Armed Forces or the merchant marine.

SEC. 3 (a) Section 203 (c) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 679) is hereby amended by striking out the words "end of the last complete biweekly pay period" and substituting the words "beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period."

(b) Section 203 (d) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is hereby amended by striking out the words "end of the last complete biweekly pay period" and substituting the words "beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period."

(c) Section 208 (a) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 is amended by striking out the words "end of the last complete biweekly pay period" and substituting the words "beginning of the first complete biweekly pay period."

SEC. 4. The foregoing provisions of this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 5. Section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953 (Public Law 455, 82d Cong.), is hereby repealed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, after line 18, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 4. Under no circumstances shall any sums authorized or made available by this act be used to pay any civilian officer or employee (except an officer or employee stationed outside the continental United States) for any period of terminal leave in excess of 60 days; and if such officer or employee reenters the service within a period equal to that for which he was paid terminal leave he shall be required to refund to the United States an amount covering the period of accumulated unused.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are willing to accept the amendment, and take it to conference.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have prepared an amendment somewhat along the same line, which I ask to be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CARLSON to the committee amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 5, beginning with the word "only," in line 10, strike out down through line 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in accordance with the act of December 21, 1944. However, no officer shall be considered, by reason of the enactment of this act, to have been transferred to a different leave system within the meaning of such act."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CARLSON. I will be pleased to yield to the Senator, or, if he desires the floor in his own right, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. JENNER. I desire the floor in my own right.

Mr. CARLSON. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 4654) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as an explanation of my position on the bill which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 4654

Section 1: This section would remove from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951—

(a) Presidential appointees in the executive branch of the Government whose rates of basic compensation exceed the maximum of grade GS-18 (at present \$14,800).

(b) Chiefs of missions in the Foreign Service and others who receive compensation at one of the rates authorized in sections 411 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (\$15,000 to \$25,000 a year).

(c) Such other officers as may be designated by the President. However, it is specifically provided that the President may not remove postmasters, United States attorneys, or United States marshals.

Section 2: This section suspends the entitlement of those officers who are exempted from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 as a result of the enactment of the bill, to liquidation by lump-sum payment, during the period of their exemption from such act, of the accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which they are entitled immediately prior to their exemption from such act.

The accumulated and current accrued annual leave to which any such officer is so entitled is to be liquidated, by lump-sum payment at the rate of compensation which he was receiving immediately prior to his exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, if, while he is within the class of such exempted officers, he is separated from the service, dies, or is transferred out of the exempted service to a position under a leave system other than the leave system provided by the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

Section 3: Under the present act, regular accumulation limits of from 60 to 90 days take effect at the end of the last pay period in the calendar year. This means that employees who have reached the regular accumulation limit must use or forfeit all leave earned in the year by, for example, December 21 or 22. Thus, they must lose leave which, within a few days, could be used over the Christmas and New Year's holidays. This section allows accumulation limits to take effect at the beginning of the first pay period of the calendar year, thus permitting the use of unused accrued leave over the Christmas and New Year's holidays, while maintaining the advantages of pay-period accounting.

Section 4: This section provides that the foregoing provisions shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period following enactment.

Section 5: This section repeals section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, thereby reinstating the accumulation provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

A reasonable amount of flexibility in the use and accumulation of annual leave is desirable for a number of reasons:

(1) The committee is convinced, on the basis of testimony by the Civil Service Commission, Bureau of the Budget, General Accounting Office, and others that the restriction on accumulations of annual leave is costly and unduly burdensome to administer. It is costly because (a) under certain circumstances when employees are forced to take time off or lose benefits to which they are entitled their work is done by others on an overtime basis at overtime rates of pay, (b) it is necessary for agencies to maintain dual records on each employee which increases overhead, (c) its effect is reflected in higher turnover and lower employee morale.

(2) During emergencies or rush periods it may be advantageous to the Government to restrict the use of leave on a partial or total basis within an agency or even throughout

the Federal service as a whole. Under these conditions, if leave cannot be accumulated, administrative officials must either force employees to lose earned leave or grant leave which results in loss of production and may require work by other employees at overtime rates of pay.

(3) Employees earn only 13 days annual leave during each of the first 3 years of their employment. During the 4th through the 15th years, they earn 20 days per year, and thereafter 26 days per year. Not all of this time is available for vacation purposes for the reason that every absence from duty for any reason is charged to the employee's leave account.

(4) Federal employees, unlike most employees in private employment, are not covered by the Federal unemployment insurance program. The only financial protection against unemployment Federal employees have is the accumulated annual leave standing to their credit.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the following resolution:

Resolved, That pursuant to Public Law 32 of the 83d Congress, the Speaker announced the appointment of the following Members to serve as members of the Joint Committee on Observance of the 50th Anniversary Year of Controlled Powered Flight: Mr. HINSHAW of California, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, Mr. SCHENCK of Ohio, Mr. BONNER of North Carolina, Mr. PRIEST of Tennessee, and Mr. MACK of Illinois.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF FRANCISZEK JARECKI, A POLISH FLIER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to have the attention of the Senate for a few moments. Back in the days when this country was struggling for its liberty, the names of Pulaski and Kosciuszko were very familiar to the people throughout the Thirteen Original States. Those men had joined with us in our fight for liberty. Very recently, the newspapers told of an incident involving a modern hero from Poland. It was the story of a young Polish flier, a boy 19 years of age, who had been separated from his mother when he was 9; who was captured by the Russians, and indoctrinated and inoculated with communistic thought from the Kremlin. The name of that young man is Franciszek Jarecki. The Russians felt that they had made this boy subservient to the concepts of Marxism, but he so well concealed his reactions that he became one of the great lieutenants in the Russian Air Force.

A few weeks before he decided to leave Russia, there came to his attention the fact that the Russians were getting a new jet plane; so he delayed his departure. He obtained one of those planes. Then, as he was flying in company with three other men, he decided that it was time for him to join up with what he called Anders Army of the Free Poles. He forthwith flew his plane to Denmark, where he landed. He was imprisoned for 13 days. Upon his release, he found his way to England, and, finally, to America. He now wants to join the American Air Force, to fight at this time

for the country for which Kosciuszko and Pulaski fought more than 150 years ago.

Mr. President, it is my great privilege today to have this young man in the Senate gallery as my guest. I ask him to rise, that we may honor him with our plaudits.

[Mr. Jarecki rose from his place in the gallery, and was greeted with applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to remind the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators that I happened to be at Idlewild Airport when this young man arrived from across the seas. I believe I was the first Member of the United States Senate to have the opportunity of welcoming him to our country, and of assuring him of our appreciation of the fine work he has done. We are very happy that he is here, and I sincerely trust that we may have much benefit from his splendid services.

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 8. It is Order No. 267 on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a consolidated general appropriation act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JENNER obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, immediately preceding the request for a quorum call, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who had been acting for me at a time when I was attending a meeting of the Republican Policy Committee, moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 267, Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, providing for a consolidated general appropriation act. I now ask for action on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a consolidated general appropriation act, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

WAR IN KOREA

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, we owe a debt of gratitude to the leader of the Socialist Party of Britain.

Clement Attlee has pulled the wool from our eyes. He has shown us the proposed sell-out of our fighting men in all its ugly nakedness.

At the Pacific political conference, to be held 90 days after the cease-fire in Korea, we are to sign away our honor and give Soviet Russia and her satellites the fruits of victory.

Mr. President, have we been defeated by Red China? Is it true we must drink to the last drop the bitter brew of defeat? Are the Communists victors who must receive the rewards of victory?

We have not been defeated in the field, Mr. President.

Never in all our long history, from the days of the Indian fighting in the wilderness, have Americans fought more bravely against more cruel odds than our American youth have fought against in the Korean theater in what was in reality the battle for Asia.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that we were never meant to win the war in Korea.

The plans were laid, down to the last detail, to push our men quickly off the Peninsula at Pusan, and leave all Asia to the Red forces.

The Communists in the Soviet Union, and their obedient agents in this country, knew Korea was halfway round the world from our sources of supply.

They knew Korea had been chosen for the decisive thrust because it was the most unfavorable terrain for a nation whose advantages lay in modern industrial power.

The Communists in Russia and in Washington knew we would be hopelessly defeated.

But our fighting men and our fighting military leaders did not understand defeat. Our Navy did not know it was impossible to steam across the Pacific in time to get the Marines into battle. So they did it.

Our commander in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, did not know it was impossible to strip Japan of our garrison forces.

Our supply men did not know it was impossible to get planes and guns across the Pacific.

Our salvage men in Japan did not know it was impossible to get pieces of junk from Pacific island dump heaps and turn them into parts of planes and vehicles.

Our airmen did not know it was impossible to go up in the fog, but they did it.

The American forces were not driven back into the Pacific.

Instead, they drove the Korean Communist forces back in total defeat.

Our commanding general and his advisers turned the line at Inchon and recaptured South Korea.

The Red Chinese entered the war. We surprised them as they formed their new invasion army. Our forces had to withdraw, but turned to fight again, ready for the final test.

All this is to establish one all-important fact: the Communist forces were

defeated in the spring of 1951, more than 2 years ago.

General Van Fleet has now made even clearer what was then unmistakably clear.

He says without equivocation that on April 28, 1951, the so-called U. N. forces had stopped the last big Red offensive cold, and a counterattack at that moment would have sent them reeling back toward disaster.

I repeat, Mr. President, General Van Fleet says our Armed Forces had disastrously defeated the combined North Korean and Chinese Communist armies 2 years ago.

When the Soviet peace proposal was broached in June, 1951, the short-wave radio networks around the world were filled with statements of foreign spokesmen:

The Americans will never accept the Soviet peace offer. They have won the war. American firepower has proven it is superior to the vast manpower pools of Asia.

Everybody knew we had won the war—everybody but us.

Faced with the fact the Reds were beaten, did the pro-Red clique in our Government hesitate? No, Mr. President. They decided to do by indirection what they had bungled by letting the military use part of their strength.

In the 2 succeeding years, someone in our Government snatched defeat from the jaws of victory, and lowered the proud standard of American military power while our officials bent the knee to the new barbarians.

First of all—and this is not a digression—the American people and their spokesmen had been persuaded in early 1951 to send American troops, as well as American materiel, to Europe, though all the fighting was in Asia.

Mr. President, let me ask you this question: If you were one of the masterminds in the Kremlin, planning to destroy America without arousing her strength, if you had to quench the patriotic fire roused by prolongation of the fighting in Korea, could you have imagined any better way to keep down the fighting forces in Asia, and to keep them short of ammunition, than to build up a fictitious crisis in Europe?

Mr. President, let us never forget that this game is played on the world chessboard, and the debate on sending troops to Europe in early spring of 1951 was in fact a debate on not sending them to Korea. Having carefully diverted attention to Europe, the appeasers could move in Asia.

On April 10, 1951, the American commander in the Far East was summarily dismissed. He first learned of his dismissal from Mrs. MacArthur who had been told by an aide who had heard it over the radio.

What evil deed of our American commander occasioned his dismissal? He had asked the Reds if they were ready for a cease-fire and warned them that, if they were not, he would step up the attack. That was good American offensive strategy, and conformed at every step with military etiquette for commanders in the field.

On May 17, President Truman said he had dismissed our commanding general

because this offer of an armistice wrecked his, the President's, plan for peace. General MacArthur answered this admission in one of the most important statements he ever made.

He said that twice before he had made the same offer without any objection and that a cease-fire could only be regarded as in full support of any political move toward peace, and here I ask you, Mr. President, to listen carefully while I quote exactly:

Unless an agreement was in contemplation on the enemy's own terms.

General MacArthur knew then, as many Senators knew then, that on March 24, 1951, an agreement was in fact in contemplation to make peace on the enemy's own terms.

Our political leaders were working then to destroy at the council table, and in the press, the hard-won victory of our men on the battlefield.

In May 1951 I said:

For months the administration's artists in propaganda have been softening us up in preparation for a Yalta peace in the Far East, for a settlement which at first looks like a victory, but like Yalta, would in reality be a sellout.

I even stated the terms of this sellout, because the Soviet Union had formally presented them on December 9, 1950, before the U. N.

The Soviet Union had said that peace could be obtained in Korea on two conditions.

First. That all foreign troops be withdrawn immediately from Korea.

Second. That the decision on the Korean question be entrusted to the Korean people themselves.

I said then:

All the Soviet Union wants is to get the American Armed Forces out of Asia.

Then time and the fifth column will do the rest.

Mr. President, these are still the Communist aims in Korea.

We must always translate Communist statements from their Aesopian language into words which make sense to us.

The most recent Korean peace proposal, that prisoners of war be turned over to five neutral nations, is proposition one in Aesopian language.

If the Communists cannot get our forces out, they will get us to invite the troops of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and India into the Korean Peninsula.

And who, Mr. President, will direct the operations of the troops of Poland, of Czechoslovakia, and India—indeed, of all five neutrals—if they operate under a single command?

The other Communist goal was liquidation of free China and admission of Red China to the U. N., with Nationalist China's seat on the Security Council.

We can be grateful to Mr. Attlee, because he has brought out into the open what, until now, has been clothed in the softest, most ambiguous language.

Recognition of Red China is the only real barrier to a peace agreement in Korea. The prisoners of war are pawns in this cruel game of power politics. They have never been the real issue.

The Communists haggle over 48,000 prisoners so we will forget the 400 mil-

lion Chinese prisoners of war we are to abandon for all time.

The pro-Communists in Britain and the pro-Communists in the United States can never give up their insistence on placing Red China on the Security Council, because that is the No. 1 objective of the U. S. S. R. in Asia.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from Indiana remember that when Mr. Acheson returned from Europe there was a joint meeting of Congress to enable Congress to hear the results of Mr. Acheson's visit?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; I recall that.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. Acheson spoke for about an hour and said only one thing which, so far as I knew, we had not heard many times before. He led up to it fast and got away from it fast, but he said that the United States would not use the veto in order to prevent the recognition of Communist China. Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. JENNER. I remember that very well.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator remember any change in the State Department policy by Mr. Acheson later or by Mr. Dulles since he has taken office?

Mr. JENNER. I have noticed no change.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will further yield, he will no doubt remember that Great Britain was one of the first to recognize Communist China, followed by India and other nations. Does the distinguished Senator from Indiana remember that the junior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD in 1949, and again in 1950, a couple of mutual security pacts?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; between England and Russia and between France and Russia.

Mr. MALONE. There is a mutual security pact between England and Russia, one paragraph of which reads almost exactly like a paragraph in the Atlantic Pact, which we have signed with England and other nations.

Mr. JENNER. I recall that.

Mr. MALONE. It provides that the signatories shall do everything in their power to assist each other.

Does the distinguished Senator remember that France has the same kind of pact with Communist Russia, containing similar paragraphs?

Mr. JENNER. I do.

Mr. MALONE. On April 4, I believe it was, the junior Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD a similar paragraph from the mutual security pact between Communist China and Russia. Does the distinguished Senator remember that?

Mr. JENNER. I recall.

Mr. MALONE. There is another pact, which the junior Senator from Nevada has not yet obtained, but which he believes he will obtain, between England and France. This pact was made subsequent to the two mutual security pacts,

made separately with Russia. It ties the ends together.

So we have all these mutual security pacts—England with Russia, France with Russia, Communist China with Russia, and the Atlantic Pact, between ourselves and the European countries. We have England recognizing Communist China. Does the distinguished Senator see any connection between those pacts and the continual insistence by Churchill—who, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Nevada, is one of the finest operators in the international field—on wetting down the operations in Asia at all times, so that England might keep her pact with us and keep the pact with Russia at the same time?

Mr. JENNER. I agree with the Senator.

The Soviet Union will never desist and never let its followers desist, until that aim is won.

We cannot retrace all the devious steps, Mr. President, by which we were kept in a state of confusion while the Communist sympathizers made one carefully planned move after another to push us toward the final sellout.

General Van Fleet has told us how, after the Red forces were defeated, our troops were refused permission to follow up their victory.

Our commanders could not use any body of troops larger than a patrol without approval from Washington, and that approval was never given.

We all know, Mr. President, how our armies were refused the right of hot pursuit, the right to bomb troop concentrations and airbases, where bombing would reduce casualties to our forces.

The most fantastic fact, in this fantastic dream world, is that our soldiers were ordered to limit the war to the territory of our allies.

They were expressly forbidden to make the Reds angry by attacks on their soil.

I am sure this is the first time, in all history, that a victorious government boasted it had confined the war to the territory of its friends, and had not let a shot be fired against the territory of the enemy.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does not this hark back to the time when the 17 Marshall plan countries, including our supposed Allies in the Korean war, had approximately 100 trade treaties with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries, and were selling them everything from tool steel to engines, trucks, and other articles they needed to fight a world war against us?

Mr. JENNER. That is all a part of the entire picture. As I say, I cannot trace all the devious ways, but I think I have put the pieces together so that the American people can clearly understand what is going on and what has been going on.

Mr. MALONE. Have there not been conferences in Vienna between 40 Russian representatives and businessmen from all over Europe, in an effort to make new treaties and new arrangements for further trade with the area?

Mr. JENNER. I think that is correct.

Mr. MALONE. As a matter of fact, do not these mutual-security pacts, the trade treaties, and the orders which we give our troops not to fight too hard for fear they might win, all dovetail together?

Mr. JENNER. They do.

Our demolition bombs fall on Korean railroads and power stations. Our napalm bombs set fire to Korean buildings. Our naval guns bomb Korean harbors, while the Chinese cities and roads and harbors are safe by order of an American President.

Perhaps some Americans have not thought too much about whether the war was fought in Korea or in China, but the French have noticed and the Germans have noticed, and the Southeast Asians have noticed. I am certain, Mr. President, that the Soviet leaders have noticed, because they planned it that way.

But the perfect confusion, the really effective smokescreen, was that on the diplomatic front, especially in the United Nations. I cannot take time to trace all the moves on the diplomatic chessboard, Mr. President. First, the U. N. aim was unification of all Korea. Then we were told that returning to the 38th parallel was a glorious victory. We were told stopping in mid-Korea was repelling aggression, a nice soft-spoken word in place of attack.

This is as if our police, called in to catch a burglar who was murdering a man in his bed, should say to the thief, "You must go outside the window because entering is a crime, but, if you shoot your victim from outside, we cannot touch you. We have been told to confine this police action to the interior of this house and not risk unpleasant violence by going outside to fight you."

Senators will remember the protestations that our forces must not bomb Manchurian bases because that might make the Reds angry. Russia, it was said, might come in. Is she not in, with everything she is willing to risk?

As his final legacy, Mr. Acheson left the Indian peace proposal by which we committed ourselves in advance to a Pacific political conference in which the wishes of the American people would be hopelessly out-voted. Like a retreating army, planting its boobytraps to snare the advancing foe, the pro-Communists passed the Indian proposal, after a stage-managed hesitation, and left it to plague the Eisenhower administration.

Recently, we heard of an apparent modification of the plan to sell out the Nationalists.

Instead of compelling the Formosa Government to accept the rule of Red China, we have a new plan to make the Nationalist Government sovereign over Formosa only, that is, to amputate most of its territory, and then put it under a U. N. trusteeship.

That proposal is different in form but not in substance, Mr. President.

We know that Formosa would be eaten up by Red China, as soon as public opinion had been softened up.

This plan was repudiated by President Eisenhower, but its sponsors will come up with the same idea in a new dress.

If you watch, you will notice how skillfully our spokesmen now refer to the

Red Chinese as China and the legal government as Formosa.

That plants the suggestion that the Nationalists are only an island.

In the old days we used to have recognition by formal acts of governments.

Today, recognition of an invader is achieved by getting the commentators to "condition" the public to words embodying the change, as Pavlov used to condition his captive dogs to new associations.

In fact, calling the present war, the Korean war, is in itself a semantic booby trap.

It has never been a Korean war.

It has, from the beginning, been a war over Asia.

By calling it a local war our mentors conditioned us to thinking we had "limited" the war when we were fighting on the territory of our friends and protecting the territory of the attackers.

The pro-Communists have followed this one objective of getting Red China recognized and installed in the U. N. ever since the fall of China.

We have the exact words of their plan from the testimony given by Harold Stassen to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on the "briefing session" he attended at the State Department in October, 1949.

At that session the IPR inner clique, led by Owen Lattimore, were spokesmen of the party line.

They mentioned two objectives to help the Reds—the first, to put an end to the Nationalist blockade of Red China, and second, to get China's seat, in the U. N. and on the Security Council, for Communist China.

Said L. K. Rosinger: "In terms of preparing American public opinion for recognition, there is a process of disentanglement from the Chinese Nationalists," by which he meant we should end ECA aid to China, refuse to help the guerrillas, and then withdraw recognition.

Benjamin Kizer, also of IPR, said, "The American people will rather quickly adapt themselves to it." Like Pavlov's dogs again.

Let me remind you, Mr. President, of what we all know well.

Almost the first act of President Truman in June, 1950, after he sent American forces into Korea, was to order the American Fleet to protect the Red China coast against the ships of Free China.

It is impossible but true. The plans of the pro-Soviet inner circle to help Red China were put into effect by an American President as almost his first action in the Korean crisis.

No words of mine could adequately describe the shame of that order, Mr. President.

The proud American Navy was ordered to protect the Red Chinese commerce in war essentials to be used against our own flesh and blood.

No words of mine could adequately describe the honor that will justly come to President Eisenhower throughout history for his prompt lifting of that shameful, traitorous order.

For 2 years longer the inner circle worked and schemed to get the Chinese attackers accepted as a respectable nation.

They hatched the idea of having our State Department get England and India

to recognize her first so we could seem to follow the procession.

They said we must take "affirmative action to throw the Nationalist Government out of the United Nations."

I want to remind you, Mr. President, of what we all know.

Two years ago the Red Chinese were a barbarian horde.

They had some seasoned fighting men, but they had no economy to back them up.

Their war equipment moved over the Trans-Siberian Railroad at snail's pace.

The Red Chinese have used that 2 years of grace to kill off the Chinese who dared to resist them, or transfer them to the camps of Siberia, or the mines of Czechoslovakia for forced labor.

In that 2 years they have used their slaves to build railroads, airfields, submarine bases, munitions factories, while the blood of American soldiers dripped, dripped, dripped into the soil of Korea.

I want Senators to understand what defeat in this war means.

It means that the United States—not the United Nations, but the United States—has been defeated by a China which could not defeat Japan or Russia, which could not today defeat the Nationalists, if they had guns.

Do you think, Mr. President, the Japanese do not know that?

Do you think the Indians do not know it, or the people of southeast Asia or the Philippines?

There is something else we must understand to get the full measure of this proposed defeat.

If Red China has "peace" and a place in the U. N., how long will it be before the airstrips in Tibet are filled with bombers pointed at New Delhi?

How much help will the American people send to Indochina the next time?

How long will it be before Japan is drawn into the economic boobytrap already set for her?

What will the freedom of Formosa be worth then? Or Okinawa?

How far will the Communists be from Pearl Harbor?

Do you think our allies in Europe will trust us to liberate them as we "liberated" Korea?

Why should they, Mr. President?

If Red China takes her seat at the council table of the U. N., if she is given China's permanent seat on the Security Council, she will be part of the political power which commands our Armed Forces in Korea, in NATO, and our ships on the Atlantic Ocean.

Her 400 million slaves will be trained by Soviet officers and Soviet industrial managers to become one gigantic war machine for the conquest of all Asia and the United States.

Let no one try to tell us later they did not know, Mr. President. They know now.

But far more serious than all of this, what will happen to our own fighting men, Mr. President?

Americans always have fought as if they were sure of victory. A thrill of hope spread over Western Europe when American troops landed on the soil of France in 1917. A thrill of hope spread over Western Europe when the Europeans heard American troops would fight

by their side after Pearl Harbor. A thrill of hope spread over the world when it was learned that American troops had at last stood up to the Communist hordes in Korea. Even here in Congress we rejoiced at the bravery of our troops in Korea, although we were deeply disturbed over the unconstitutional method of our entry.

If our troops who won a decisive military victory over Red China, must hang their heads in shame because Red China won at the council table, what will happen to the hearts of our fighting men? We shall have cut the hearts out of American fighting men.

Where are we now, Mr. President? On the military front, General Van Fleet has told us in no doubtful words:

In terms of high strategy, the Reds have lost the war in Korea, and they know it.

Only the United States Army today has the superb kind of leadership and planning which can conduct the prolonged, fluid attack, the war of motion.

We have the one army in the world that can regroup as it goes along, hitting hard here, then starting a thrust somewhere else, constantly moving, maintaining the full fury of attack, never giving the enemy a chance to rest or dig in.

Mr. President, such an army could be defeated only at home.

The Red Chinese are beaten. In Korea we do not need a substitute for victory. We have the hard reality of victory, and the Red Chinese and the Russians know it. But the Soviet Union still expects to win by its skill in the psychological war, by fooling the Americans into giving the Communists what they want.

The Korean war was won in the hills of Korea. It will be lost—if it is lost—in Washington—not in London, not in Paris, not in Panmunjom, but in Washington.

If the Communists can fool us, all is lost. If they cannot fool us, all may yet be saved.

President Eisenhower has tried very hard to get us out of the morass of State Department thinking, but he is handicapped. The Communist Government of Russia still has a pro-Communist fifth column at work in the United States, as it has in Britain, trying to confuse our foreign policy, and put over Soviet peace aims under the cover of confusion.

By the Soviet fifth column, I mean members of the Soviet apparatus who work in the open party organization, members of the Soviet underground, "sleepers" who have no visible contact with the Soviet apparatus, so-called Americans who believe the Communists are going to win, and will do their bidding for a few husks of power, and fuzzy-minded Americans who can be fooled by words, who are without any ability to understand them.

We dangerously underestimate the power of the fifth column.

The 15 volumes of the IPR Report of the Internal Security Subcommittee tell us why President Eisenhower is handicapped, Mr. President. The 5 volumes of the Russell Report and the current reports of the Internal Security Subcommittee all tell the same story.

Our Federal Government and our agencies of public opinion are still honey-

combed with men loyal to the Soviet Government or willing to accept orders from the Soviet agents in return for power, or, in a few cases, duped by constant repetition of the slogans the Soviet Union wants us to believe.

On March 29, 1950, Lord Vansittart told the House of Lords, in connection with the Fuchs affair, a similar story of the penetration of Communist influence into the very heart of British life—into broadcasting, education, the church, military intelligence, the diplomatic services, the armed forces, the Government services, and the great unions of Government employees. He had, himself, met people, he said, who were afraid to talk because they had been told they would be "bumped off" for their anti-Communist efforts, if war came.

Lord Milverton, in the same debate, pointed out that Communists and communism in Britain were the headwaters for communism all over the Empire, particularly in Malaya and in British West Africa, where Communists were spreading into every department of the public service.

If we want to know where we are, Mr. President, we can always look to the France of 1940. We know now why France, with the "greatest army in Europe," offered only token resistance to the Nazis. It was the Communist fifth column, in alliance with Hitler, which delivered France to the Nazi armies.

I should like to believe that this apparatus is not at work in England, but I know it is. I should like to believe it is not at work in our country, but I know it is. I should like to believe that the members of this fifth column were driven out of power by the recent election, but I know we shall have no such easy road to security at home.

I sit day after day—and for almost 3½ hours today—in meetings of the Subcommittee on Internal Security, learning of new ramifications of Communist power over our war operations and our postwar policies. But we still do not know what the Communists are doing today, except that, by every trick they have ever learned, they are throwing dust in our eyes and confusing our leaders and our people, so they will not be able to block the insidious power of suggestion of the pro-Soviet apparatus.

We have to solve the problem of foreign policy, including our Asia policy, while the fifth column is throwing dust in our eyes; while it is spreading rumors, turning Americans against each other, trying to discredit the courageous spokesmen for truly American solutions.

I say, Mr. President, that if we continue to drift, if we wait without a goal or a plan, while the trained fifth column presses forward under orders from the Soviet high command, we shall sink lower and lower until we fall into the gulf toward which we are being guided.

I repeat, Mr. President, if we go on as we are going, without a specific American strategy, Red China must win the war.

Mr. Atlee has done us a great service. He has made us look defeat in the face—to see its hideous features no longer veiled by soft words of propaganda. The

acquiescence of Mr. Churchill makes the picture perfectly clear. Either we must tell our fighting men we have sold them out and we are going to build up Red China into a great power or, with a mighty effort, we must cut ourselves off from every tentacle of this evil power, and must fight our own way back to health and life and national safety.

I say, Mr. President, that President Eisenhower can free himself now from the toils, if he choose a program which has in it not the smallest particle of appeasement, if in the whole Asian settlement he acts as vigorously as he acted to end the shameful protection, by our Navy, of the Red China coast.

Our President already has taken three major steps in the direction of American independence.

First was the order to the Seventh Fleet.

Second was the appointment of wholly new Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Third was the statement that we would never abandon our opposition to forcible repatriation of prisoners, because it was a moral issue, of central importance in the values of the free world.

The next step is an equally final statement that we will not recognize the blood-stained murderers of Red China as the legal government of China, or admit her to U. N.

To appease the Red regime in China is to imperil our own survival—

Says General Van Fleet.

When Mussolini invaded the little kingdom of Abyssinia, Haile Selassie stood before the League of Nations and begged the members, on moral grounds, to put restraints on Mussolini. The members refused. They could not bother with moral issues. The League of Nations crumbled there and then.

The admission of Red China, with her bloody hands, into the U. N. is a moral issue. If the U. N. votes to admit a cruel slave-state which invaded a peaceful, law-abiding Korea, U. N. has no moral excuse for being. All the high-sounding words are without meaning. The only choice for the United States is to withdraw.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has introduced a resolution stating the American position. I should be happy to join in sponsoring such a resolution to strengthen President Eisenhower's hand.

I know the great majority of our colleagues will never descend to the dishonor of approving Red China as a legal entity. I know they want to stand up and be counted.

Armed with a clear statement of American insistence on moral principles, the President can formulate an American program for Asia.

We do not want to cut ourselves off from our allies. We want to save ourselves from the Communist spell. If our allies wish to do the same thing, we can all go forward together.

We should tell the Chinese delegates at Panmunjom that if they do not want to sign a cease fire, we shall resume full-scale war, but that war will be carried on with no holds barred.

We should promptly carry out President Eisenhower's proposal fully to equip the armies of South Korea.

We should face the bitter facts of geography and rearm the Japanese.

Permanent demilitarization would have been ideal for Japan, if Sakhalin and the Kuriles were not occupied by Soviet Russia.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Did we not force Japan to sign a treaty which established the Russians in the islands referred to by the Senator, and within shooting distance of Japan?

Mr. JENNER. I am saying to the Senator that we must face the realities. We created the present situation.

Mr. MALONE. Then, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I ask him whether the natural trading area of Japan is not southeast Asia.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct—southeast Asia and Red China.

Mr. MALONE. It includes Red China now. Southeast Asia is supposed to be controlled by our allies, is it not?

Mr. JENNER. It is supposed to be.

Mr. MALONE. Is the distinguished Senator from Indiana aware that Japan is not allowed to trade at all in the Malayan States or in Indochina, and is prevented therefrom through manipulation of currency, quotas, and various other devices, on the part of America and England, which devices operate against the Malayan States and against Indochina?

Mr. JENNER. We all know that Japan is in a booby trap.

Mr. MALONE. I am sure the Senator understands that we are allowing Japan to trade, practically on the basis of free trade, in the United States, with the probable result of the shutting down of plants in certain industries in our country.

Mr. JENNER. Japan is being forced into the arms of the Communists.

Mr. MALONE. I think some of us so stated when we returned from the signing of the Japanese Treaty at San Francisco. I would ask the Senator again, is it not obvious that that is the case, in view of the fact that most of those whom we still refer to as our allies have recognized Communist China, or have signified their intention of doing so?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that England may appropriately be said to be the leading ally in that regard? Is it not generally taken for granted that that is the case, since England was the first to recognize Communist China?

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Most of our so-called allies have trade treaties with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries, and are shipping materials to them without stint. Is the distinguished Senator from Indiana aware of the fact that they are now threatening, aided by England and France, that if we do not give them free access to the markets of the United States for their low-cost sweatshop-labor products, they will if possible set up their

trade with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries?

Mr. JENNER. Yes, not only that they will do so, but they are already setting up those trade relations, as the records will show.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Nevada does not believe it possible for them to step it up to very much more than what it is now. The Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate, several years ago and placed in the Record the trade treaties they had already entered into with Russia and the Iron Curtain countries. In 1950, as I recall, according to the latest figures there were 96 such treaties. I thought the country would be shocked by the statement of those facts. The country was not shocked. In fact, it shocked no one. But I would again ask the Senator, How are we to deal with allies who have received strategic materials and arms from us, and who have recognized Red China, and have done everything in the world against our best interests?

Mr. JENNER. What I am advocating today is that our best strategy is to look after America.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator from Indiana is doing a great service to our country by what he is saying on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. JENNER. I ask, which is better, for Japan to defend herself, or for American troops to garrison and defend her? The answer is obvious. We should give to Free China at least as much aid as we give to Japan.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it possible for any nation to defend another nation?

Mr. JENNER. Not unless that nation has the will and the heart to defend itself.

Mr. MARTIN. We talk much about ammunition; we talk about great guns and about the atomic bomb, but unless the will to defend itself is present a country cannot be successfully defended from the outside. Is not that a fact?

Mr. JENNER. We are worrying about sending supplies to Korea. When our boys in Korea are short of equipment, we should send it where it is needed.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not a fact that what we need to do is to give the truth to the American people? We heard on this floor an hour ago a magnificent address on the economic condition of this country, setting forth why we have inflation and what it is necessary to do in order to avoid inflation. What we need to do is to give the people the truth. The American Colonies won their independence because they had the will to win it, not because they had arms which were superior to those of England, but because they had the will to be free. Unless a nation wants to be free, no amount of money that can be appropriated will make it possible for that country to keep itself free.

Mr. JENNER. I agree with the Senator and thank him for his contribution.

Which is better—for Japan to defend herself or for American troops to act as a garrison to defend her? The answer is obvious. We should give to free China at least as much equipment and training as the U. S. S. R. gave to Red China.

Friends of the United States should not use secondhand equipment and work without technical training, while satellites of Red China forge ahead in the very fields in which we lead.

I am not a military man, and I cannot give an expert military judgment. But Senators are supposed to know how to choose experts and judge expert opinion.

From everything I have heard and read, Mr. President, I believe the people of China are only waiting for an opportunity to rise up.

I hear many experts say the Nationalists cannot recapture the mainland, but they are all experts in words, in propaganda, not military experts.

Soviet Russia is arming the oppressors of the Chinese, but in spite of big talk, we have steadfastly neglected to arm the defenders of these helpless victims of Communist inhumanity.

We have neglected the only possible protection for Indochina—the return of the Nationalists to the mainland.

I do not want war with China, Mr. President. I do not want war with the U. S. S. R. I even dread to see the Free Chinese invade their homeland and attack the Reds.

It would be intolerable, if the Communists were not killing more Chinese in their deadly "peace" than would die in a war of independence.

Far from enlarging the war, I believe arming all the free nations of Asia is the only hope of peace.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JENNER. I should like to conclude, because I must leave the floor in a few moments.

Mr. President, there are, perhaps, 20 million fighting men available in free Asia today.

Does anyone believe the U. S. S. R. would start a war, if these men were armed to defend their homelands?

No, indeed; the Soviet Union prefers to wage psychological war to tell us not to arm the Asian nations, but, if we do not swallow her bait, we can be free of fear.

To oppose communism, we must also have an idea that lifts the imaginations of men.

The American idea of liberty has always been a symbol of hope, of light in darkness.

It is a glowing idea which, set against Communist deeds, will tell its own story of our faith in human dignity.

The American principle which we can stress for the world today is the principle of national independence.

We believe in independence. We fought a war for it. We came to the help of the people of South America when their independence was threatened. We helped preserve the independence of China. We gave national independence to the Philippines.

The United States is not engaged in any duel with the Soviet Union for domination of the world.

We will not make ourselves into an imperial power system, to meet the Soviet threat. We will choose our own ground. That ground is to take up our moral leadership in the struggle of the Asian people for national independence.

Let us set against the Soviet idea of empire, President Eisenhower's principle that every nation has a right to its own government, free of compulsion by any other power.

People who loved liberty have always trusted our country because Americans have never lost their deep interest in weak or small nations which must fight great powers for their own independence.

Patrick Henry and Valley Forge are still too close to us for Americans to bear tyranny patiently.

We, in turn, can trust nations which are seeking only independence, because people who truly love their rocks and rills, their wooded and templed hills, have no wish to desecrate the homeland of others.

Nations are born out of love. Imperial power systems are born out of the will to dominate.

Let us accept the leadership of all those nations which aspire to keep their homeland free.

Let us accept the moral leadership of those people who want to fight the new slavery.

Communist China is and must remain one vast slave-labor camp.

The Soviet leaders will use their recently acquired technical arts to wring high production from unwilling workers.

They will end resistance by moving their human pawns to other parts of the Soviet chessboard, where their victims will have no friends to hear their cries.

Let us promise to any country ready to fight for its independence that we will give them arms and equipment equal to those of any country which threatens them.

Our only condition should be that they are ready to fight for their own freedom.

We do not want our Asian friends to die for us. They are dying now. We want them to live. We want them to carry a soldier's pack instead of a prisoner's chain.

Against the subtle, devious, shifting policies of the Soviet Union and her fifth column let us set a simple, firm, unyielding policy based on moral principle.

Against the lies, the smears, the rumors, the blandishments of Soviet propaganda, let us set our own strong determination to keep our minds clear, our wills firm.

I believe, Mr. President, the outcome will be peace, an American peace; but whatever the outcome, we can all meet it together, so long as it is peace with honor, or war with honor, in defense of man's inalienable right to freedom.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I have been informed by an official who is in charge of the draft in my State that they are now at the point of drafting 19-year-old men and are worried about the number which can be secured in the future without taking men who served in World War II.

The Government is \$270 billion in debt. That is the heritage of 20 years of

the kind of Government we have had during that period.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Indiana has given the Senate something to think about today, something it ought to consider very seriously, because we are at the end of our rope if it is true that we are now down to 19-year-olds in the draft. We have gone \$270 billion into debt and are figuring on another \$10 billion deficit at the end of the year. Therefore, as the Senator from Indiana has suggested, we must take stock and see what areas we can defend and what we can do with the materials and manpower we have. Does the distinguished Senator agree with me?

Mr. JENNER. I agree; and I am hoping that the new Chiefs of Staff will take a look, and take it quickly.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will further yield, I may say that it is time the new Chiefs of Staff took over. We have had the menu read backward by political generals for about 10 years. What I mean by reading the menu backward is that when the administration wanted something done the generals cooked up reasons why it ought to be done. That is the conclusion I arrived at a good many months ago.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations under the heading "New Reports."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick M. Alger, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward T. Wallis, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUTUAL DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter S. DeLany, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Herbert D. Vogel, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a consolidated General Appropriation Act.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beall	Hendrickson	McClellan
Bennett	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Jackson	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Green	Martin	
Hayden	McCarthy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GORE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THYE, Mr. TOBEY, Mr.

WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was to strike out all after the resolving clause, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the 83d Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the 'Consolidated General Appropriation Act' (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure as of the beginning of the fiscal year, other than the obligated balances of expired appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from the bal-

ances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (B);

"(E) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from revolving and management funds, other than expenditures referred to in clauses (C) and (D);

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on revolving and management funds (including the funds of wholly owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in a preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado desire recognition?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do. However, I should first like to give the proponents of the measure an opportunity to discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 is sponsored by 50 Senators. I invite attention to the fact that among the 50 sponsors are 11 members of the Committee on Appropriations. I have reason to believe that several other members of the Committee

on Appropriations will vote in favor of the resolution, which will mean that a majority of the 23 members of the committee support the resolution.

I invite attention to that fact because of the peculiar interest of the members of the Committee on Appropriations in the resolution, and to the further fact that, with one exception, all the chairmen of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations are sponsors of the resolution. The chairmen of the subcommittees are the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture; the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services; the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices; the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor-Federal Security; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative and Judiciary; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, and Commerce; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office.

Mr. President, I may say further that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who has served as chairman of the Appropriations Committee both at this session and in the 80th Congress, has been one of the first and one of the most active supporters and advocates of this measure, which provides for a consolidated appropriation bill and, in addition, provides for a limitation of expenditures. Senator FERGUSON has been especially active throughout the years for a consolidated bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in response to the statement by the Senator from Virginia that all or practically all chairmen of subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee favors Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, let me say that every Senator who was chairman of a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee at the time when we had a one-package appropriation bill, and who bases his present opinion upon his actual experience with the laborious work which was imposed upon him as a result of that bill, is opposed to the pending measure.

In other words, Senators who now favor the concurrent resolution have not yet been through the mill.

Mr. BYRD. In any event, for the most part the Senators who are sponsors of the concurrent resolution were Members of the Senate at that time, and many of them were then members of the Appropriations Committee. Further-

more, most Senators now favor the concurrent resolution because it is entirely different from the former measure, as I shall explain.

Such a measure was first reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration in 1947, by the then Senator Brooks, of Illinois, who was chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, the measure failed to pass the Senate at that time.

A similar measure was reported on June 2, 1949, by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], on behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and was approved by the Senate, but was not approved by the House of Representatives.

A similar measure was reported by Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, in 1951.

The concurrent resolution now before the Senate was reported by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], after hearings held by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

First, Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that the pending concurrent resolution provides for an entirely different kind of consolidated appropriation measure than that which was passed for the fiscal year 1951. That arrangement came about simply as a result of action taken by the House of Representatives, and was not in accordance with the measure passed by the Senate, which failed of passage in the House. At that time the procedure was simply to put together into one package, so to speak, the 12 appropriation bills.

The pending concurrent resolution goes further, by providing that there shall be a limitation of the net amount to be obligated during the fiscal year in the case of each appropriation which is available for obligation beyond the close of the fiscal year. That is a great improvement over what was attempted in the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why could not that be done under the present method of handling the appropriation bills?

Mr. BYRD. It could be done, but it never has been done.

Mr. ELLENDER. How does the Senator from Virginia know it will be done if we have a "one package" bill?

Mr. BYRD. Because it is required by the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution will have all the appropriations put into one bill, and will limit the obligations on the basis of new and old appropriations, and will require that an estimate of the expenditures be set forth in the report. That is not required at present, and such an estimate is not set forth in any of the reports of the Appropriations Committee.

In the body of the appropriation bill there will have to be a statement of the revenues, so that the total expenditures will be set forth, on the one hand; and the total available revenues, according to the Treasury's estimate, will be set forth, on the other hand. Then we shall know whether we shall be voting for a deficit or for a surplus.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it intended that the appropriations shall not exceed the revenues? Is that what this concurrent resolution proposes to accomplish?

Mr. BYRD. No. I am not speaking of the appropriations. The Senator from Louisiana well knows, for he is a member of the Appropriations Committee, that an appropriation does not necessarily mean an expenditure in the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made.

Let me state the situation as of today, under the present system. First, let me say that I have been a Member of the Senate for nearly 21 years, and I have never seen greater confusion with respect to appropriations than exists today, because under the present system we shall have \$82 billion of unexpended balances, as of the 1st of July of this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Virginia know why that condition exists?

Mr. BYRD. Yes; I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator from Virginia know that the House of Representatives forced on us a rule which provides that before any Government department can enter into a contract, the money has to be actually appropriated, instead of having Congress provide contract authority?

Mr. BYRD. I understand that fully. I am not saying why the confusion occurred, but I am saying it has occurred under the present system, whereas the pending concurrent resolution provides that the funds may be appropriated, but the amounts to be expended each year will be limited, and thereby we shall arrive at a definite conclusion, regardless of whether there is a balanced budget.

Under the present arrangement there is no control over the expenditures until the money is actually spent by the various departments. That situation has brought about the present large unexpended balances.

I agree with the Senator from Louisiana as to how that condition occurred. For example, the House has required that if a battleship is to be built—and its construction may take 4 years—the entire amount required for construction of the battleship must be appropriated at one time, during the first year, and that means that in the following 3 years the Congress will have lost control of that expenditure, in the sense that the matter never will come before Congress again.

The plan now proposed provides for a limitation of expenditures. Thus, if a battleship, for example, is to be built, it will be possible to provide contract authority, if Congress chooses to provide it, and it will be possible for Congress to review the expenditure as the money becomes payable, in the same way that any business organization does.

With the present unexpended balances in the amount of \$80 billion, what is happening in the case of the appropriations to be made at this session? Nearly one-half of them will be expended in fiscal years following the next fiscal year. The result will be that the same system will be continued into the

fiscal year 1955, and so forth, until a change is made.

Although I know that every member of the Appropriations Committee is most able and most diligent, yet I challenge any member of the Appropriations Committee to state definitely, when an appropriation bill is before the Senate, the amount of the appropriations which will be spent in the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made. Yet that is the factor which determines whether we have a deficit or a surplus.

I know very well that in the general operations of the Government the question of whether there will be a deficit or a surplus is determined by the cash income and the expenditures. I do not use the word receipts, because the Government collects money from social-security payments and other payments which constitute receipts, but do not constitute a revenue to the general Treasury, for expenditure. Instead, such funds are really trust funds.

Every once in a while we hear someone say we must balance the cash budget. That would mean taking the social-security payments and other payments and using all cash receipts of the Government to balance the cash budget, which, of course, is not a proper procedure. At the present time the arrangement is that in the Government's reports on its financial situation, the cash income, on the one hand, is set forth as opposed to the cash outgo, on the other hand, for the fiscal year. That arrangement makes no allowance for the obligations of the Government or the amounts due in the form of tax refunds, and so forth; but on June 30 of each year a balance is struck in accordance with the cash income of the Government and the cash outgo, and that is the way the Government now runs its business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the Senator from Virginia is saying that the concurrent resolution is an attempt to tie the appropriations and the expenditures closer together and to give Congress a better understanding, when it is making appropriations, of the amount of money which will be spent in the fiscal year for which the appropriations are made. Is not that the purpose of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, that is the purpose, and the Senator from Massachusetts has very correctly stated it.

Under the provisions of the concurrent resolution, we shall have a consolidated budget. When the budget is sent to us it will be consolidated, and the income of the Government will be set forth in the budget; all that information will be set forth in one document. Thus, the concurrent resolution carries out the theory, as I see it, of such a budget system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for another question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that today the Government's books are kept on a cash basis, so that the Govern-

ment itself does not know what obligations it has outstanding, until the bills come in for payment? Consequently there is not a close connection either between the revenues and the expenditures or between the expenditures and the appropriations.

By putting all the appropriations in one bill and stating how much money is to be expended under them in one year, what is sought to be done is to make it clear what the appropriation is and what the expenditure is. We can then determine how much revenue is necessary in order to balance the budget, to balance the cash expenditures and receipts. Is that not what the Senator from Virginia is seeking to do?

Mr. BYRD. That is certainly what the Senator from Virginia is trying to do, together with the other 49 sponsors of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This resolution represents one step in that direction, does it not?

Mr. BYRD. I think it a very effective step, because it will require that the amount of the expenditure in each particular fiscal year be limited in the bill. In order to understand the fiscal condition of the Government, we must separate appropriations from expenditures. Of course, we must appropriate first, as everyone knows, but there are certain appropriations which are not expended for 2, 3, or perhaps 4 years after they are made, and in that situation it is impossible to conduct the business of the Government in an orderly way.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question.

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that almost every State of the Union, and a great many municipalities, have a more advanced, modern, and up-to-date method of bookkeeping than has the Federal Government, which spends vast billions of dollars?

Mr. BYRD. I think that is correct. Of course, we must recognize today that there is no easy way to appropriate and spend \$80 billion, because that is about 30 percent of the total income of all the 155 million Americans. There is no easy way to do it. I do not claim that our proposal will completely take the place of what must be done to effect true economy. Economy is the result of cutting down on expenditures. But I submit that the adoption of the resolution will give all of us a much better opportunity to understand what we are doing. The 12 appropriation bills come before the Senate at different times. Frequently they are voted upon hastily and without the Senate Chamber being filled with Senators, as I think it would be if there were the one appropriation bill. When the "one-package" appropriation bill was considered in a previous session the attendance was greater and the consideration and discussion were more complete than when the 12 bills reached the Senate at different times.

We often hear it said, when one appropriation bill comes before the Senate, "Well, I am for economy, but I am not going to have it taken out of this par-

ticular activity. I think we ought to economize all the way down the line, yet the other 11 bills are not before us." There is, therefore, the argument that we should not economize on the particular bill then under consideration; whereas if we had all the bills before us, we could compare the requests of the different departments, we could ascertain what the increases were in the different departments, and could use our judgment and decide what should be done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true also that what the Senator is seeking is to make it possible for Senators to know how much the appropriation will be for one department or subject this year, how much will be spent during the year, and how much will be obligated, so that in the next Congress, or in the next session of the same Congress, they will know the obligations with which we start before we appropriate for the ensuing year? The Senator said a few moments ago that we are going ahead, but making no improvement. If the pending resolution should be adopted by both Houses, then at least when the next session of the Congress convenes we will have a better idea of what is hanging over our heads awaiting our consideration, before we appropriate new funds, and we will know how much revenue we have with which to make expenditures. Am I correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. Under the concurrent resolution all the pertinent information is required to go into the reports, and much of it goes into the bill. For example, it is required that there be included in an appropriation bill an estimate of the revenue, the latest estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury, and then a statement of the totals of the bill can be counted up on an expenditure basis for that current year, not on an appropriation basis, but on an expenditure basis. It would be possible to ascertain in that manner, with a fair degree of accuracy, whether there would be a deficit. The pending measure does not prevent commitment of appropriations in the form of contracts. It only limits the expenditure for the particular year.

Mr. President, I now wish for a moment to refer to our present fiscal condition, which I may say looks very black to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before the Senator moves into that phase of his discussion, will he yield to me?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia is aware of the fact that under the Constitution all revenue-raising legislation must originate in the other body. The other body has construed that provision to extend to all appropriation measures. Does the Senator's concurrent resolution do anything to clarify that situation, or to give the Senate the power to originate appropriation bills?

Mr. BYRD. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not deal with that subject?

Mr. BYRD. It does not deal with it at all. It is a concurrent resolution, and, of course, must be agreed to by the House. It proposes to amend the joint rule of the two Houses.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand, but it occurs to me that one of the disadvantages of the single-package appropriation bill is the fact that it would tend to make even more unequal the respective positions of the Senate and the other legislative body with respect to appropriations. The House would have complete control over the timing of the passage of the single-package bill. If they were to pass it, let us say, in the middle of June, right on the eve of the beginning of the new fiscal year, we would only have a few days in which to consider and act upon it.

If we are to have the one-package bill, it seems to me the Senate ought to devise some way by which to originate appropriations. There is nothing in the Constitution that denies us that right, but the cold facts are that the House has always refused to consider any appropriation bill which originated in the Senate, and we are now handicapped in maintaining our position as a coequal body because of the fact that the House insists on originating appropriation bills. If all appropriations were put in one bill, and we were to adopt such a massive budget or spending program just on the eve of the beginning of the new fiscal year, it occurs to me the Senate would be still further handicapped in maintaining its position as a coequal branch of the Congress. It would give the other body great power because, if a bill comes to the Senate late in the fiscal year, there will be tremendous pressure on us to get the bill out of committee and pass it, without giving it the consideration which we would be entitled to give it, if we are to maintain our position as a coequal body in dealing with appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. I may say to the Senator from Georgia that the experience with the last one-package bill was that it reached the Senate earlier than was the case with the separate bills. It reached the Senate by Easter. There is no reason why there should not be simultaneous hearings. In fact, that is what is being done now. The Subcommittee on the Armed Services, under the able leadership of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], is having hearings now, and the House committee is also holding meetings, though the bill has not yet come over from the House. It is possible to have simultaneous hearings and, under the concurrent resolution, provision is made for joint hearings if desired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I observe that provision in the concurrent resolution, and, of course, we have had hearings before Senate committees time and again before the appropriation bills had ever passed the House. But the cold fact is that unless we have adequate time on the floor of the Senate in which to consider the bills, there is an infringement upon our position as a coequal body. The bills come to the Senate separately, at various times. This year some of them came to the Senate in March. I believe the single-package bill came from the House in May, did it not?

Mr. BYRD. It came to the Senate about Easter of that year, in April.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it was in May. My recollection is that it came to the Senate in May. However, I defer to the superior judgment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Many of the appropriations bills have not yet come to the Senate, though this is the last of May. The larger appropriations are still in the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator recalls, no doubt, that the single-package bill passed by the House at a previous session did not contain all the appropriations. He probably remembers that one of the largest and most controversial items in that bill, and, in fact, an item involving one of the big issues before the Congress, was the foreign-aid appropriation. If I recall correctly, foreign aid was not included in the alleged one-package bill when that system was in effect in the Congress.

I wish something could be done that would assure the Senate a fair chance to consider a one-package bill. There is provision for both simultaneous and joint hearings. But if a one-package bill is brought to the floor of the Senate only 3 or 4 days before the beginning of the new fiscal year, it will be impossible for the Senate and the individual Members of the Senate to have the opportunity to which they are entitled for the consideration of the measure on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BYRD. I should first like to answer the statement of the Senator from Georgia. Economic cooperation and foreign aid were in the appropriation bill, under title I, chapter 11.

Mr. RUSSELL. That may well be; but if I recall correctly, it was put in in the Senate. I am quite confident that a study of the RECORD will show that the foreign-aid item did not come to the Senate from the House. We added that provision in the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has a good memory, I know, but it was in the bill as enacted.

Mr. RUSSELL. My recollection is that when the bill came to the Senate we had not even passed the authorizing legislation for foreign aid. My memory is not infallible, but I do remember a great deal about the foreign-aid item. We had to hold the bill in the committee for some time in order to put the foreign-aid provision into the bill and to allow time for its passage.

Mr. BYRD. On June 25, 1950, during the consideration of the bill, there were a good many complications, but, notwithstanding that, the bill was finally signed on August 6, 1950. Since that time some other appropriation bills have not been passed until October or November, and we had to pass resolution after resolution continuing certain appropriations.

As a matter of speed, the RECORD shows that the one-package bill, imperfect as it was, made a very creditable

showing, considering the fact that the Korean war broke out in the midst of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. My recollection is that the bill did not become law until some time in September.

Mr. BYRD. That is when the President signed it. I am advised that the bill was passed on August 6.

Mr. RUSSELL. But it did not become law until some time in September.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, we could not make the President sign it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am aware of that, and I suppose the President wanted some time in which to study the bill.

That is another reason, Mr. President, why I am apprehensive about a single-package appropriation bill. It compels departments of the Government to wait until Congress has agreed on the last item before they are aware of what programs they can plan for the fiscal year. If we had completed action on appropriations for 11 departments, and there were still unacted upon the appropriations for the Department of the Interior, for example, 11 departments would have to mark time for several weeks; in fact, there have been occasions when it has been months in the new fiscal year before they were aware of the new programs they were to follow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me for 5 minutes, providing he does not thereby lose the floor? I should like to try to reply to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Colorado may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I am worried about the very points which the Senator from Georgia has raised and about the difficulties to which he has called attention. I have tried to think of a way to overcome the difficulties, and I think I have discovered a way.

First, Mr. President, I want to say that I am wholly and completely in accord with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I was a member of the Senate, though not a member of the Appropriations Committee, when the Senate had before it the single-package appropriation bill. I considered it to be a great success. I think it saved billions of dollars, and I believe the idea could be carried out further along the lines which the Senator from Virginia has advocated. It could place our fiscal policies and our fiscal state of affairs on a balanced-budget basis.

It will be recalled that there is a law which we are not observing. I refer to section 138 of the Reorganization Act. I wish to read three sentences from that section. It provides for the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to meet and to work out a ceiling for all expenditures. Why should not that be done? The law provides:

Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved

for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees:

Then it provides:

Such report shall be made by February 15.

That is what the law says, Mr. President. It goes on to provide:

The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year.

That is what the law provides. It is an excellent law. If it were followed, we would get away from all the difficulties which the Senator from Georgia has mentioned, rather than to drag appropriations along until the end of the fiscal year and then not have an opportunity to discuss and to work out the amount of the appropriations which should be made.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an appropriation bill containing three pages, covering a list of all appropriations made in 1952. They are all there, contained on three pages. In volume it is not something which should frighten anyone. Any Member of the Congress, any member of the press, any of our citizens on the streets of our cities, reading this bill, can get a better idea of the expenditures and the fiscal policies of our country than could be obtained by reading the single-package appropriation bill containing 482 pages.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not have unlimited time, but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. With reference to the committees meeting and working out a fiscal program and reporting before the 15th of February each year, am I in error in believing that that was tried, but it was found impossible to make a report within that time each year? Was it not also found that a committee composed of nearly 100 members could not function, and was unworkable? Is not that the reason why it was abandoned?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is a fact that it did not work out, but it is the law. I think it could be worked out, if there is a will to work it out. Of course, if there is not a will, it will not work out. We cannot accomplish these things unless there is a will to do it.

Mr. AIKEN. There were a hundred wills to deal with when we put those four committees together. It is very difficult to work them into one will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If we cannot work things out cooperatively, we cannot solve the problem.

My bill approaches the whole problem. When I explain it, I think it will be clear to every Senator.

Mr. President, some months ago our colleague, the able and experienced new chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee [Mr. BRIDGES], very properly pointed out that Congress is employing the same techniques in appropriating eighty billions that it used when appropriations were less than five billions annually. The facts are that the important function of making appropriations in these days of huge expenditures has gotten completely out of hand. The size of

present-day appropriations has broken the back of our congressional fiscal machinery.

Something must be done to bring order out of this chaos. In that spirit and with that objective very much in mind, I have devised a new streamlined and very simple appropriation bill. It is a one-package appropriation bill and is so completely streamlined that it consists of but 3 pages, and yet, in my opinion, it provides more pertinent fiscal information for the people and for the 531 Members of Congress than the one-package appropriation bill of 1950, consisting of 482 pages.

As I say, my bill, which I call the percentage appropriation approach, is devised to give the Members of Congress and the man on the street a comprehensive perspective of Federal expenditure that he cannot get by reading the Federal budget, which ordinarily is 3 times as large as a Sears, Roebuck catalog, or by reading a dozen appropriation bills of 50 pages each, or even the one-package appropriation bill of 482 pages, which is being advocated by so many Senators.

The percentage approach, as Senators will see, first determines that \$70 billion, or some other amount, shall be the overall total of appropriations for the following fiscal year. Every schoolboy knows that a total of anything is 100 percent. Accordingly, I split that total of 100 percent up into many items of smaller percentages, the sum of which equals 100 percent and allocate these items to the various departments and functions of Government. Dividing that 100-percent pie on the basis of the relative importance and proper support for each Federal function is the very essence of the difficult job which the Appropriations Committees of Congress are called upon to make.

From long observation, I am convinced that the average Senator and the average American citizen makes little or no distinction between thousands and millions or even billions. I have seen this Senate spend hours debating the virtue of an appropriation for \$100,000 and then vote appropriations of \$50 billion in a few seconds of time without batting an eye. On the other hand, percentages are a different matter because they deal with the relationship of functions rather than with unrelated amounts. Very naturally, with respect to such matters, there is much knowledge and great interest.

Before I can grasp the actual appearance of some new object, I must make mental comparisons with it and things with which I am familiar. If someone should undertake to describe an elephant to me and I had never before heard of the ponderous symbol of the Republican Party, I might ask: "Is it the size of a greyhound or a Greyhound bus?" By making comparisons with things with which I am familiar I could get a fairly accurate picture of a pachyderm.

One instantly comprehends the situation when you say the Department of Agriculture is allocated only about 1 percent of the revenues of this Government; or that the Department of the Interior, including reclamation, gets less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of those revenues, or the legislative branch receives one-tenth of 1 percent, while the mili-

tary, including civil functions, receives almost 62 percent of the total revenues of the country. Relativity carries the same vital significances in appropriations which they do in Einstein's cosmic universe.

Keeping Federal appropriations in the proper adjustment with respect to public functions as a whole on a basis of value to the people is vital to the progress of this great country and its contentment. Balance is vital alike to the circus performer and to a fiscal policy.

The new administration has made a solemn pledge to the American voters to cease indulging in deficit spending. Congress cannot do less than give the new President full support in his efforts to straighten out fiscal problems by cutting spending. It is my earnest and considered opinion that the adoption by Congress of my suggestion for a streamlined appropriation bill with a fixed ceiling for the overall total appropriation and a fixed ceiling for each departmental appropriation and the opportunity for the Budget Bureau to review each department's appropriation after it is made as well as before, will be a long and constructive step toward bringing order out of chaos in Federal fiscal matters.

The figures and percentages used in my calculations have been assembled merely to illustrate the new approach to the difficult task of determining the correct size of all Federal appropriations. I do not say that any of them are correct as to amount. Doubtless, the Appropriations Committees would want to change somewhat every percentage point. I used the overall total of \$70 billion because the press had reported that the distinguished majority floor leader, Mr. TAFT, and President Eisenhower have agreed upon \$70 billion as a proper total for the fiscal year. My own views are that \$60 billion would prove to be a far wiser fiscal target. However, that is a matter for the Appropriations Committee members to determine out of their long experience and intimate knowledge of Federal fiscal problems. But I do contend that some overall specific total must be determined and tenaciously adhered to, come what may.

The allocation of the exact percentage ceilings to each department and function of Government would then follow after exhaustive hearings and study by the Appropriations Committees. If one department or function is given more by the committees or by the Congress under my plan some other department or function must receive less. The time-honored custom has been to allocate funds to each function on a basis of the successful salesmanship of the department in convincing Congress of its requirement and then to boost the total to accommodate the increase. Under such a system it is small wonder that in this current year we have a deficit of \$8 billion which, in my humble opinion, is a national disgrace. To indulge in deficit spending in the year in which we are enjoying the greatest prosperity of all time, with employment and production at an all-time high, is reckless beyond description. In such a year we are bonding our children's children to pay for our indulgence and waste. When honestly

analyzed, that is exactly what deficit spending means.

Without the active leadership, enthusiastic support, and inflexible determination of the Executive, no legislative body can effect economies in government. That is equally true of the city council, the State legislature, and the Congress of the United States.

The Founding Fathers who wrote our Federal Constitution did not recognize the importance of that fact and accordingly neglected to employ two very vital devices in handling Federal finances. They were afraid to make the Chief Executive too strong so they refused to give him the power to veto separate items in an appropriation bill without vetoing the whole measure, and they failed to make all appropriations by Congress for which no revenues have been provided null and void except in cases of insurrection or rebellion. Colorado, as do many States, has such provisions on its constitution. As a result there can be no deficit spending in such a State and the governor can keep his State's finances in balance and in orderly adjustment if he has the courage and the will to do so.

If the Federal Constitution had provided such safeguards for its Treasury the Federal debt would be merely a fraction of its present gigantic size and there would never be an undeclared war.

The percentage appropriation bill virtually gives the President the power to veto items through the Bureau of the Budget's authority and direction to scrutinize congressional appropriations after they are made and before expended by the various executive departments.

Greater use should be made of the Bureau of the Budget in dealing with the Federal fiscal problem. It is a large bureau with many trained and experienced technicians. It has 462 employees who are paid a total annual salary of \$3,181,000 and an average salary of nearly \$7,000 a year. In addition, there is an annual expense item of \$340,200. I am not being critical of this bureau; its operation; its size; or its costs. If its costs were three times as great I would not complain because they should be the watchdogs of our Treasury, and good watchdogs cost money.

At present they compile volumes of vital data on appropriations before enacted by Congress and thereby form a basis for the President's recommendation to Congress. So far so good, but the percentage-appropriation approach contemplates that in addition to that necessary service they ride herd on every expenditure of every executive department of the Federal Government after Congress has voted a lump sum appropriation to such department. If that were done, the President of the United States could protect the Treasury in the expenditure of every penny allocated to a Federal executive department.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot yield, Mr. President, because I do not have the time.

My bill simply provides that the sum of \$70 billion is appropriated out of any

money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for expenditure by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. That is the beginning of the bill. It starts out on a percentage basis and determines on a percentage basis how much each one of the functions of Government will get on a percentage basis.

One hundred percent is seventy billion. That would be divided into percentage items, one item for each of the functions. When we were finished, we would have 100 percent, or \$70 billion.

Recently an appropriation bill was before the Senate. I was seeking to have \$618,440 added to a certain item. Under the proposed new system, if I made such a proposal, I would have to subtract \$618,440 from some other item, because the appropriations would be in percentages. Any Senator who attempted to increase the amount of the appropriations would have to subtract from some other appropriation before he could get the increase in the appropriation he sought. That is the big advantage in the proposed method.

A newspaper in Colorado is very much sold on the idea. I sold them on it. They did not give the idea to me. They said that after the Senate finished with the appropriations this year they would reduce all the appropriations to the form of a table. I do not know whether or not they will go to all that work, but that is what they said they would do. They can then print the appropriations in a very small space in the newspaper, and the man on the street who reads the statement probably will know much more about the fiscal policy of this Nation than any of us know. I doubt whether all members of the Committee on Appropriations can possibly grasp the appropriations situation as it is now presented.

I do not wish to impose further upon the time of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], except to say that my proposal is to streamline, facilitate, and expedite the work of Congress. This is the first step. Seventy-five percent of our work is in making appropriations. I know that Senators who serve on the Committee on Appropriations devote many months to extremely hard work. They would still have to do much hard work on the kind of method now proposed. Their work would not be reduced, because, instead of appropriating in terms of dollars, they would be appropriating in terms of percentages of the total appropriation.

Mr. BYRD. It seems to me it would be necessary to have a limitation on expenditures, just as is proposed in the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true; it would be necessary. The same point is involved. I am not arguing against the Senator's resolution.

Mr. BYRD. I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am trying to answer the charge that if the Senate gets such a bulky, voluminous proposal before it that we cannot handle it ourselves, the House will take advantage of us. I say it is not necessary to have a voluminous bill. It is not necessary to have an appropriation bill as big

as a Sears Roebuck catalog. It can be reduced to 2, 3, or 4 pages, so that it can be considered with ease. Subcommittees would work on this kind of proposal just as they would work on the measures which now come before the Senate.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia allow me to take 1 more minute?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator may take his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The second purpose of the bill is to assist in halting deficit spending. It would have a psychological effect. I do not suppose a single Senator within hearing of my voice would have much difficulty in agreeing upon a total expenditure for the year. However, when we get down to the various items, such as how much is to be allowed for television, how much for this, and how much for that, that is when we get into difficulty, into long, drawn-out debate on the Senate floor, and into all the considerations that are necessary to be taken care of. It is simply a matter of psychology. We would first set the total amount, or a ceiling on the total amount, and then work toward percentages.

My third and last hope is that adoption of the proposal would make it easier for Congress and the people to understand what becomes of the taxpayers' dollars.

I should like to ask permission to have printed in the RECORD the text of my bill, and also two newspaper items, one an Associated Press dispatch entitled "Senator JOHNSON Proposes New Single Bill Plan for United States Appropriations," published in the Wall Street Journal of January 14, 1953; the other an article entitled "Fixed Limit on Spending is Proposed," published in the Washington Post of January 15, 1953.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 469) and newspaper articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$70 billion is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for expenditure by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

Sec. 2. The sum appropriated by this act for expenditure by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, is hereby apportioned among the various branches, departments, agencies, and establishments of the Government in accordance with the table contained in section 3 of this act. The sums made available by this act for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, together with any sums remaining available for expenditure from any prior fiscal years, by each branch, department, agency, or establishment shall not be increased by any other act of the Congress.

Sec. 3. The percent of the sum appropriated by this act which shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, by each branch, department, agency, or establishment of the Government is as follows:

Agency:	Percentage
Legislative branch.....	0.0960
The Judiciary.....	.0340
Independent offices:	
Executive Office of the President0090
American Battle Monuments Commission0010
Atomic Energy Commission...	5.1322

Agency—Continued		Percentage
Independent offices—Continued		
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	0.0047	
Civil Service Commission.....	.4260	
Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration.....	.1781	
Commerce—Maritime activities.....	.2230	
Defense Production Administration.....	.0030	
Defense Transportation Administration.....	.0020	
Economic Stabilization Agency.....	.0740	
Federal Communications Commission.....	.0080	
Federal Power Commission.....	.0050	
Federal Trade Commission.....	.0060	
Federal Security Agency.....	2.0507	
Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	.0535	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	.0100	
General Accounting Office.....	.0390	
General Services Administration.....	.4910	
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	.1300	
Indian Claims Commission.....	.0001	
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	.0137	
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	.00001	
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....	.0083	
Mutual Security.....	7.4744	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	.0825	
National Capital Housing Authority.....	.0001	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	.0008	
National Science Foundation.....	.0059	
National Labor Relations Board.....	.0012	
National Mediation Board.....	.0014	
Renegotiation Board.....	.0067	
Revolving fund, Defense Production Act.....	.0019	
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	.0065	
Selective Service.....	.0458	
Smithsonian Institution.....	.0048	
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	.0004	
Tariff Commission.....	.0024	
Small Defense Plants Administration.....	.0047	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	.4185	
Tax Court of the United States.....	.0011	
Veterans' Administration.....	4.8164	
Independent offices, total.....	21.5610	
Department of Agriculture.....	1.0438	
Department of State.....	.2948	
Department of Justice.....	.2296	
Department of Commerce.....	.5858	
Department of the Interior.....	.6793	
Department of Labor.....	.2771	
Department of Defense:		
Civil functions.....	3.5931	
Military functions.....	58.0047	
Department of Defense total.....	61.5978	
Department of the Treasury.....	.8157	
Post Office.....	3.4655	
District of Columbia.....	.0137	
Permanent appropriations for general and special accounts:		
Interest on the public debt.....	7.6589	
Other.....	1.4616	
Grand total.....	100.000	

Sec. 4. The Bureau of the Budget is authorized to control the amounts actually expended from the sums made available by this act for expenditure by each department,

XCIX—350

agency, or establishment of the executive branch, except the following arms of Congress: the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the United States Tariff Commission.

[From the Wall Street Journal of January 14, 1953]

SENATOR JOHNSON PROPOSES NEW SINGLE-BILL PLAN FOR UNITED STATES APPROPRIATIONS

WASHINGTON.—Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Colorado, proposed that Congress adopt this novel plan for providing the money to run the Government: Vote an overall amount and fix a percentage of it for each department and agency.

He would have Congress junk its present bulky and complex appropriations bills.

Senator JOHNSON introduced a bill to carry out his plan. He said it was designed to bring order out of chaos, halt deficit spending and make it possible for Congress and the people to have a better understanding of where the taxpayers' dollars go.

Congress now enacts a dozen or more regular money bills each year. One, for example, tells exactly how much the Treasury and Post Office Departments may spend, and for what functions.

Several years ago, Congress tried a single appropriations bill, but it was in reality just a collection of the usual bills. The difference was that it provided an immediate overall total of appropriations.

Senator JOHNSON's proposal would go further. The single bill he has proposed would fix the total amount the Government could spend and earmark a fixed percentage for each department and agency.

The Atomic Energy Commission, for example, might be voted 5.13 percent of whatever total appropriation Congress approved, the Federal Security Agency 2.05 percent, the Defense Department 61.39 percent and so on—but in no event could these allotments add up to more than 100 percent.

One effect of this would be to make lump-sum appropriations to each department, rather than earmarking funds or various purposes. Senator JOHNSON stated the percentage allocations would be made only after exhaustive hearings by Senate and House Appropriations Committees.

[From the Washington Post of January 15, 1953]

FIXED LIMIT ON SPENDING IS PROPOSED

A Democratic Senator proposed yesterday that Congress put a top limit on Federal spending each year and then cut it up, like a pie, with slices to each agency on the basis of its importance.

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, who has been in the Senate 16 years, said the present system of lading out money piecemeal is "notoriously antiquated and sickeningly slipshod." He added the people must feel Congressmen are "a bunch of boobs" on finances.

JOHNSON said he will introduce a bill appropriating \$70 billion for the 12 months beginning next July 1. He gave that figure because, he said, that is the amount President-elect Dwight D. Eisenhower and Senate Republican Leader ROBERT A. TAFT are reported to have agreed on.

Actually, the Colorado Democrat said, \$60 billion would be a "far wiser target" for next year but he added the exact amount is up to congressional committees to decide.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when I introduced my bill on January 13, I raised the question covered by the bill with the Comptroller General of the United States. I recited

the law, and asked him if the appropriations we were making violated the law or were valid appropriations. In about 2 weeks I received the following letter from Mr. Frank L. Yates, Acting Comptroller General of the United States. It is short, so I shall read it.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 9, 1953.

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: Reference is made to your letter of January 16, 1953, requesting my views on the question as to whether the practice of the Congress in appropriating funds for the expenses of the Government without strict compliance with the provisions of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946, 60 Stat. 812, 832, constitutes a violation of law endangering the validity of appropriations.

A report in the matter has been unavoidably delayed, but will be submitted to you in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General of the
United States.

That is the last I have heard from him, or that I expect to hear, on the subject. I do not wish to ask him about it again, because I do not desire to embarrass him.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it the Senator did not get a report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I did not get a report, and I feel certain that I will not get it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BYRD. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if in the bill he introduced on January 13, 1953, he had the effrontery to try to hold the Congress of the United States to a \$70 billion appropriation expenditure for the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not have quite that much effrontery, but I do have quite a little effrontery, and what I am proposing in the bill is that Congress determine what the amount shall be, whether it be \$70 billion, \$60 billion, \$80 billion, or whatever the amount may be. Appropriations would then be provided on a percentage basis, but Congress would be bound by the total amount of appropriations it fixed.

As the Senator from Nevada knows, the present method of making appropriations is to appropriate money piecemeal, so much for this item, so much for that item, and so much for something else. We do not work under a ceiling, but we keep piling up expenditures. Then when we have finished we add up the appropriations, and that is how we arrive at our ceiling. My proposal is to start with a ceiling, and then divide up the individual appropriations.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he had some idea, when he introduced the bill providing for a ceiling on appropriations, of first trying to consider what the

taxpayers could pay, and then to make appropriations according to that assumption.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Nevada has been gazing into his crystal ball, because he has put his finger on exactly the purpose of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that I am, of course, in favor of the Byrd resolution, because it should shock the Senate and shock the country to see what we attempt to appropriate in one lump sum. Perhaps it might have some effect on the vote later when we come to approving the amount.

I am for the proposal of Representative REED, in the House, and I am for the one-package bill, if it will accomplish what it attempts to do, or for any other bill that attempts to determine what the taxpayers of America may be able to pay. Then we can read the menu backward and let the departments work within those amounts.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand the Senator from Colorado, he is in favor of the principle of the consolidated appropriation bill on a more simplified basis. Nevertheless, he favors the principle of the consolidated appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. With regard to the questions of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I wish to read a section of the concurrent resolution. I read from page 9, line 19:

The Appropriations Committee of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

I cannot believe that our associates in the House would deliberately hold up an appropriation bill if the delay could be avoided.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I was not impugning the good faith of the Members of the House.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated that we would be at the mercy of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct; but there are many vicissitudes in the course of legislation which are not brought about by bad faith. There are often delays which come about through the ordinary parliamentary processes, and are not at all prompted by bad faith.

Mr. BYRD. I did not mean to say that. The fact is that when we had the single appropriation bill before, the bill was reported to the Senate about the last of April. This year, under the old system, the largest bills have not yet been reported to the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to refer briefly to our present fiscal status. We are to have a deficit this fiscal year of about \$7 billion. There was a loss of income of about \$1½ billion, according to the estimates, for the fiscal year 1954. Assuming the reduction of expenditures as represented by the President, the deficit will be approximately \$5,700,000,000. That is on the assumption that there will be a reduction in expenditures of \$4½ billion. I may say that up to this time not to exceed 10 percent of such

reduction has been put into actual effect. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. RUSSELL. I always yield to the superior knowledge of the Senator from Virginia on fiscal matters.

Mr. BYRD. Up to this time I do not think there has been an actual saving of more than four or five hundred million dollars.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true with respect to the bills which have passed both Houses.

Mr. BYRD. It is very difficult to ascertain the savings on an expenditure basis. There will be a deficit, along the lines of the President's message, of about \$5,700,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and unless there are still further reductions in the fiscal year 1955, there will be a deficit of \$10 billion, because the full effect of the tax reductions will then be in operation.

As I see it, in order to balance the budget under the President's program, and with the tax reductions he has advocated, not counting those whose expiration we oppose, we must cut from the present Truman expenditure figure something like \$14 billion, in order to balance the budget in 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] stated that 2 or 3 years ago billions of dollars were saved, by means of the one package bill. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Virginia can tell us how that saving came about.

Mr. BYRD. I do not know the exact figure of savings. It is very difficult to determine what the savings are on an expenditure basis. Last year I think the largest single reduction that was made in an appropriation bill was \$800 million. I think that is the largest single reduction that has ever been made.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was that because the appropriation bill was a single-package bill?

Mr. BYRD. The saving was the result of a reduction by 10 percent in a large number of appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] introduced an amendment to each bill to reduce it by 5 to 10 percent. A number of bills were so amended. It is very difficult to determine how much is saved, because of the manner in which the appropriations are made.

Mr. BYRD. If a reduction is made in an appropriation which is not to be spent for 2 or 3 years, there may not be any saving, because in the interim Congress may pass another appropriation for a particular purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to make some brief comment with reference to the pending measure. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, the author of the concurrent resolution, that I joined with him on a previous occasion in his resolution providing for a consolidated appropriation bill. In theory I think it is a very good idea if it can be carried out in practice. If it can be put into practical ef-

fect, very profitable results can be achieved.

Senators will recall that last year we passed a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. As I recall, the bill passed the Senate by a vote of 55 to 8. It went to the House of Representatives, which did not consider it. The motion to consider the bill, or a companion bill, lacked 15 votes of the number necessary to make it the unfinished business.

Last week the Senate passed substantially the same bill, with a slight modification. The Senate passed it unanimously, and the bill is now before the House.

In my judgment, if this plan is to be workable, practicable, sound, and effective, it must be implemented by the Joint Committee on the Budget. The Joint Committee on the Budget, as we all know, is simply a joint subcommittee of the two Appropriations Committees. It must be provided with a staff to dig out the facts and the information to show us where reductions can be made.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia supported that proposal.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know the Senator did, and I thank him.

I believe that if this measure is enacted it will become almost indispensable that the additional service to which I have referred be provided.

The concurrent resolution provides for joint meetings of the two committees, and joint hearings. I think that is indispensable to make this system work and get the maximum benefit from it.

Mr. President, with a Government as large as ours, appropriations for about \$80 billion of expenditures a year, I think the time has come for members of the Appropriations Committees, if they are to do their job, to devote themselves exclusively to that task. I believe they have no time to serve on other committees. Service on the Appropriations Committees is becoming a year-round job. As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations I would dislike to give up my membership on the legislative committee on which I serve. But if we are to do the job efficiently, and hold Federal expenditures down to the minimum, we must put more time, effort, and energy into the job and concentrate on it with the best tools with which we can provide ourselves, regardless of what legislation we enact, if we are to economize and limit expenditures to objects and purposes which are absolutely necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on many occasions I have spoken on the fiscal policy of the Government of the United States. Since I came to the Senate I have served on the Appropriations Committee.

I had intended to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] a question, but I know that his time was limited.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, under section 138 of the Reorganization Act of 1946 I participated in meetings of the Joint Committee on the Budget. I did not find that it was the number of members on the committee that interfered with its func-

tioning. I think there was a feeling that we did not want to know how much money we would have to spend, because it might interfere with our appropriations. I say that honestly. I think there was a feeling among the members that we—and when I say “we” I mean the Congress of the United States—wanted to have a free hand to appropriate, disregarding what the Nation's income might be. I served for many years on that joint committee with the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] as well as on other committees having to do with appropriation matters. He has discussed the subject from the angle of knowledge of what the national income is to be. Knowing what the income is to be, we can look at the whole fiscal picture and determine what the appropriations should be. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] also referred to that point.

What we must have, Mr. President, is the will to do the job. The job can be done, not with separate appropriation bills, but with a consolidated bill. It can be done if we have the will to do it.

I ask the distinguished Senators who are now on the floor, how are we to tell following the passage of the first regular appropriation bill, for instance, with the many items it contains, how much money that bill should have contained in order to help balance the budget?

Aside from a few Members no one in the Senate knows what is contained in the next appropriation bill, and what we should take out of it and what we should let remain in the bill.

How can we balance the budget as between expenditures and income from taxes on any such basis?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Michigan has put his finger clearly on the difficulty. I served on the joint committee. We did not have the will to determine what the ceiling should be. If we do not have the will to do it, it will be very hard to bring it about.

However, that is the point to start from, not the point at which to end, as we do at the present time. In other words we end with the ceiling, whereas we should start with the ceiling.

Mr. FERGUSON. I remember that the Senator from Colorado served on the joint committee. I believe there was in the committee the feeling to which he referred. If we knew how much money the Government was going to receive from taxes, we would not be inclined to appropriate so freely, and we would not have so much freedom with reference to making appropriations. We did not have the will to impose a ceiling. We should have realized that Congress was destroying its control of the purse strings.

That is why, as I see it—and again I say it will take a will to do it—provision for a consolidated appropriations bill should be adopted by Congress. The House should work on such a bill as soon as the budget is sent to Congress, with the Senate dividing the work on the bill, after it comes from the House, among

the various subcommittees, as it does today. The committee could then work on the various items, and when the bill came to the floor every Senator would know exactly the total amount of the appropriations contained in the bill. At the same time he would know the total amount of the anticipated receipts from taxes. Thus he would be able to determine, at that time, the answer to the question: “Do I, as a Senator of the United States, want deficit spending?”

If he wants deficit spending, he knows at that moment how much the deficit spending will amount to. If he then votes for deficit spending, he is telling the people back home in effect, “I knew we were going to have deficit spending, and I willingly accepted it. Not only did I know we would have deficit spending, but I knew how much it was going to be, and I voted for it, knowing all the facts.”

I say, with appropriations coming before us in a piecemeal fashion, one at a time, as in the case of the bill passed last week, no Senator can know whether a deficit will be incurred. The amount of that bill was small; but no Senator could know to what extent the appropriations in that bill would contribute to a deficit. With a consolidated bill before him he would be in a different position.

I agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]—and I was co-sponsor of the bill to which he referred—that there should be in Congress a joint committee of the kind provided for in his bill. We should have such a joint committee working in conjunction with a consolidated appropriation bill.

Until we know how much every bill is going to cost the taxpayers of the country we will not do very much with respect to deficit spending and deficit financing.

Why do I say that, Mr. President? My experience on the Committee on Appropriations has taught me that when a department submits a new item or asks for additional employees, and we inquire as to the reason for it, invariably the reply is: “During the last session the Congress passed such and such a bill, and because of its enactment into law we must now have additional employees or additional funds in order to implement it.”

Many years ago legislation passed by Congress did not involve large bureaus and large agencies. Such large establishments were not necessary in order to execute the legislation enacted by Congress. However, considering the kind of legislation being passed today—and I say too much of it is being passed—the time has come when it can be stated that the fewer bills Congress passes the better the Congress is.

With each bill that is passed we should have before us, from the Director of the Budget, an estimate as to the cost of its operation, if the bill is passed, for the first year, and perhaps for the next 5 years. Otherwise, we will not be able to control expenditures.

On the next call of the calendar, bills will be passed with respect to which Members of the Senate and Members of

the House will not have the slightest idea of the cost they entail upon the Government.

Such questions can be worked out if the pending resolution is adopted. Questions like that can be worked out even by the committees. In fact, no legislation on that point would be needed, because we could ask the Director of the Budget to furnish such information.

I return to the statement I made in the beginning. If there is a will, there can be a way. Unless all of us decide that we are going to know as much as we can about the income of the Government and about expenditures, we will never be able to balance the budget, particularly if we are to have separate appropriation bills. In that case we can have no knowledge, until we pass the last bill, whether or not we will have a balanced budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield, gladly.

Mr. ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, when it is submitted to us, does not the budget give an estimate of the anticipated revenue?

Mr. FERGUSON. It does.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does it not also state how much money is to be expended by each department, as well as whether the Government will be in the red or in the black?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course it has been in the red for the past 20 years, I know.

Mr. FERGUSON. For 18 years out of 20.

Mr. ELLENDER. There were 3 years during which the budget was balanced. In 2 of those years we canceled a great many contracts entered into during World War II, and we imposed additional taxes soon after the beginning of the Korean war. Aside from that there has been a deficit each year. Is it not a fact, however, that such information is furnished to the Senate and to the House by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana that he has that knowledge and the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has that knowledge, because he is continuously studying the question of income and expenditures.

Mr. ELLENDER. Each Senator receives a copy of the budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think it would be casting any reflection upon a Senator to express a doubt that many Senators could read the budget and do anything else.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not necessary to read all the items. A summary is provided, which shows how much is to be spent by each department and how much the revenues will amount to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana this question: How much did the last appropriation bill contribute to deficit spending?

Mr. ELLENDER. How much?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish I knew. Does the Senator know?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Louisiana would know if we had a consolidated appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. How?

Mr. FERGUSON. Because he would know the amount of the income and the amount of the total expenditures.

Mr. ELLENDER. We know that now.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator can find out just as easily with 10 separate appropriation bills as he can with 1 consolidated bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, he can. The amount of money to be expended by each department is set forth in the budget, and the amount of the revenue is set forth in the budget. If we add the amounts set forth for the budget of all the departments, and if we then deduct the amount of the revenues, we determine the deficit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. But what happens is that the Appropriations Committee recommends making certain cuts in the appropriations provided by a bill, or else perhaps the Appropriations Committee recommends that the bill be passed in the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. All we have to do is compare the amount of money actually appropriated in a specific appropriation bill with the amount of appropriations recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for that agency, and in that way we can determine whether the amount of appropriations is greater or less than the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. But suppose we pass an appropriation bill in the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Such action on only one appropriation bill will not make it possible for us to know whether the budget will be balanced. If in a following appropriation bill Congress appropriates less than the amount of appropriations recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, Congress still will not know whether the budget will be balanced.

On the other hand, if all appropriations are set forth in one bill, at one time, Congress will be able to determine whether the budget will be balanced or how much out of balance the budget will be.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. No Member of Congress is more interested in balancing the budget than am I, but I think the Senator from Michigan will agree with me—for he and I have been on the Appropriations Committee a long time—that one of the greatest troubles we have in connection with appropriations is not because of the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget or because of what the Senate Appropriations Committee recommends or what the House of Representatives votes, but is because of the authorization bills which are passed by Congress. When such bills are passed, we never know how much money they will finally cost.

I have voted many times to provide the appropriations required by authorizations which previously have been voted. But I ask the Senator from Michigan, if he agrees with me that the difficulties arising as a result of authorization bills are about the worst difficulties we have, because following the passage of such authorization bills, we never know how much money they will cost.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree that one of the greatest troubles we have is that when we act upon authorization bills, we pay little or no attention to their ultimate cost.

Mr. MAYBANK. For instance, recently we authorized the construction of 150,000 housing units, and later the number was reduced to 35,000, and the number may yet be cut further. I know the Senator from Michigan did not vote for that number, but he knows that many cities have entered into contracts on the basis of the authorization bill passed by Congress. Is not that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is where the fault lies.

Mr. FERGUSON. How easy it is to have a committee vote to report an authorization bill, without knowing or appreciating how much the project will cost.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. That difficulty will not be corrected by a one-package appropriation bill. It must be corrected on the floor of the Senate, by defeating such authorization bills.

Mr. FERGUSON. The difficulty can be corrected by committee work, as I have said. If there is a will, there can be a way.

For instance, if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana were chairman of a committee which was considering an authorization bill, he could ask that before the committee voted to report the bill, it include as a part of its report on the bill a statement of the estimated cost of the bill for the first 5 years.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield again to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to hear the Senator from Michigan make the statement he has just made, because he knows how I feel about some of these matters.

The same difficulty exists in the case of public roads. I have supported public roads appropriations. However, the difficulty is that first the States make agreements with the Federal Government in regard to the construction of public roads, and thereafter appropriations are requested in amounts sufficient to cover the expenditures previously made under such agreements.

For instance, when, tomorrow morning, the public roads appropriation comes before the subcommittee of the Appropria-

tions Committee dealing with appropriations for the Department of Commerce, the members of the subcommittee will be told, "You must vote to have the Government keep its contract with the State of Michigan or the State of South Carolina"—or with whatever State may be involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; we are often told, "You have allowed the expenditures to be made, under the authorization, in the respective States, and all you are being asked to do this year is to appropriate sufficient money to cover the expenditures which were made last year."

Just today, before the Appropriations Committee, a similar situation developed. Appropriations of approximately \$30 million were requested for certain international organizations, and the committee had absolutely no control over that item.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield again to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I recall, those expenditures were authorized by the Foreign Relations Committee; the Appropriations Committee never knew a thing about them, but had to vote for appropriations for that purpose, in order to have the Government keep the contract which was made with the United Nations.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. As I have said, the Appropriations Committee had nothing to do with the question of whether the \$30 million would be spent, for the State Department had made contracts with budgets of various branches of the United Nations, and thus determined that the United States would pay 35 percent of the total cost of those budgets. Therefore, if at this time Congress does not appropriate sufficient funds for that purpose, it will be said that the Government is in default.

Certainly a government cannot be operated properly if it is insisted that unless sufficient funds for a given purpose are appropriated, it will be considered that the Government has breached its contract—a contract which was indirectly authorized by Congress, but actually was made by another agency of the Government.

That is what I mean when I say Congress has lost control of the purse strings.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield again?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will a one-package appropriation bill cure the defect the Senator from Michigan is discussing?

Mr. FERGUSON. It will not cure all evil.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course it will not.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not declare that it will cure all evil, and the Senator from Virginia does not declare that it will cure all evil. However, it will be a good start toward placing on the shoulders of every Member of Congress the responsibility of knowing what he is doing when he votes for the appropriation bill; and in such case he will know that when he votes for the bill, he will have the responsibility of telling his con-

stituents why he voted for it. That is the purpose of the one-package appropriation bill measure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sorry to have to disagree with some of my colleagues, but I still have a vivid recollection of the time when we tried a one-package appropriation bill. As I recall, we finally concluded the session in October of that year. Of course, the arrangement may not have worked well in that particular year.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The consolidated appropriation bill was passed on August 6, 1950, for the fiscal year 1951, and was signed by the President approximately 30 days later. That was one of the earliest times in recent years that Congress completed action on appropriations.

Mr. AIKEN. That still left us rather close to October.

Mr. BYRD. What happened was that the Korean war broke out on June 25, 1950, and then we enacted other appropriation bills, by reason of that war.

Mr. AIKEN. However, the desire for an earlier adjournment is not the principal reason why I shall not vote for the concurrent resolution. If we believe we now have trouble with pressure groups, I point out that we are actually having scarcely any trouble at all, as compared with the trouble we would have if Congress were to say, "We are going to appropriate a certain amount of money this year, and we are going to prorate that amount among the various governmental agencies, or the appropriations will be made on a percentage basis"—as was suggested a short time ago by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. If any Member of Congress thinks he has seen lobbying groups active in their attempts to have appropriations made, let me say that he has not yet seen anything of that sort, as compared to what would happen under the proposed one-package arrangement.

For example, the question would arise, "What percentage of the appropriations will go to the Department of Commerce, what percentage of the appropriations will be available for ship subsidies, how much will be available for foreign aid, and how much will be available for the construction of highways?"

A substantial number of people in the United States want better highways than the ones we have today.

Others would ask, "What part of the total appropriations will be available for airports, what part will be available for rivers and harbors, what part will be available for flood control, what part will be available for reclamation, and what part will be available for health?"

After all, many persons in the United States are vitally interested in matters pertaining to health.

Others would ask, "What part of the total appropriations will be available for public works, and what part will be available for agriculture," and so on.

Others would ask, "What part of the total appropriations will be available for the Air Force?"

Of course, that matter is under much dispute today, and every city and every

area in which manufacturers of airplanes or airplane parts are located is vitally interested in that subject. So we might expect unprecedented lobbying by those who would seek the most for their own special interest.

Mr. President, I believe we ought to take up each of the functions of Government and assume the responsibility which properly belongs to the Congress of determining what is the need and how much we can spend, and how we can reduce the amount to a minimum consistent with good administration. It seems to me that we should not legislate primarily in terms of dollars, but in terms of what is best for the Nation as a whole, first determining the minimum needs of the country, and then providing the necessary money, and balancing the budget in that way. It may seem difficult for some people to do it that way, but that is the way in which the State in which I live does it. A determination is first made as to how much is required, and in my State we have an unwritten law that before the State legislature adjourns, the money must be provided to meet all appropriations.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I heard the distinguished Senator refer a moment ago to his own State of Vermont. The Senator was formerly the distinguished governor of that State. I should like to know whether the Senator from Vermont is aware of any of the 48 States which do not at this time follow the practice of making appropriations in a single-package bill.

Mr. AIKEN. The different appropriations are taken up one by one, and, at the end, are placed in a single package, which requires but a short time for its passage. But the appropriations themselves are not considered as a single package.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. But when the State legislatures get through, they have a single package, and it is possible for one to see the whole picture at a glance, and to comprehend an overall picture.

Mr. AIKEN. But I do not know of any State which, at the beginning of a session, says, "We have so much money that we are going to prorate among all the different State agencies." I do not think that method would work. I am satisfied it would not. The fact that the way is left open in the pending measure for an unrestricted number of supplemental appropriation bills indicates that perhaps the sponsors of this measure do not think it would work, either.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The single package works very well in the State of New Jersey, and I am certain it would work well in the Federal Government.

Mr. AIKEN. My view is that the other system of determining the needs of the State and then having to provide the money is a very good deterrent against wastefulness in my State, and I think it would be equally beneficial on a national scale. I think we ought to legislate to meet the needs of the country. We should then balance our budget at all times, except when there

were extraordinary emergencies. There are times when a deficit is justifiable, although we all dislike the idea of a deficit.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the Congress will not undertake to abdicate its responsibility of determining the needs of each department and each function of the Government by itself. Certainly, when I am called upon to vote on appropriations for the Department of Commerce or the Department of the Interior, I do not want to have to correlate that appropriation with a thousand other appropriations at the same time. I do not think this proposal would be as workable as its proponents would lead us to think.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 6, strike out line 10; on page 8, strike out line 22; on page 17, strike out line 9; on page 20, strike out line 6; on page 32, strike out line 25; on page 39, strike out line 18; and on page 45, after line 12, insert:

A-9532298, Mathisen, Wollert.
A-1331075, Williams, George Kapa.
A-7145943, Prisciandaro, Damiano.
A-4193296, Zaganas, Leonidas alias Leo Z. Gray.
A-7019831, Begin, Joseph Real Gaeton.
A-6670579, Smith, Henry Hallam.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, which expresses congressional approval of the adjustment of status of certain cases of suspension of deportation, was agreed to by the Senate on May 6, 1953.

The House of Representatives amended Senate Concurrent Resolution 20 on May 19, 1953, by making certain technical changes chiefly with reference to the spelling of names of certain aliens embraced in the concurrent resolution.

Accordingly, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 20.

The motion was agreed to.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. Con. Res. 29) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain

aliens, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

"A-6963020, Amsel, Andor.
 "A-7898535, Avilo, Rudolf.
 "A-6992016, Balberiski, Miron or Bell.
 "A-6756307, Baqal, Mohamad Amir or Mohamad Amir Boukai.
 "A-6552873, Brotleit, Zofia Kusewicka.
 "A-9825254, Bussani, Andrew.
 "A-7099697, Chang, Peter Yun-Pao.
 "A-6431861, Chang, Jean M. Y. (nee Young).
 "A-6623722, Chang, Shau Hoa.
 "A-6623721, Chang, Tsang Wa.
 "A-6625811, Chang, Yuan Lo.
 "A-6851532, Chao, Tsel-Yu or T. Y. Chao or Chao Tsei Yu.
 "A-7073396, Chechik, Luba (nee Luba Rusak).
 "A-6848439, Chen, Min.
 "A-6830501, Dischka, Zsuzsanna.
 "A-6917990, Domb, Mozes.
 "A-7828138, Domb, Cyla.
 "A-7828139, Domb, Fryda.
 "A-7131176, Esop, Verner.
 "A-6740258, Fanaberia, Cael Morika.
 "A-6713644, Fanaberia, Masia (nee Rubin).
 "A-6886818, Feldblum, Meyer.
 "A-6536894, Fleischman, David.
 "A-68414247, Fleischman, Iona Sara (nee Eizikovitz).
 "A-6769948, Frankel, Nechemie.
 "A-6758622, Frankel, Chana (nee Wachs).
 "A-7056845, Furer, Menashe or Menasze or Menasche or Menash Furer.
 "A-7210070, Gawronski, Antonina (nee Ritigstein).
 "A-6769935, Gedeon, Elie Jabra.
 "A-6860145, Gedrovics, Alberts.
 "A-6903711, Grunwald, Alexander.
 "A-6448004, How, Julie Lien-Yng or Julie How.
 "PR901282, How, Bang.
 "PR901281, How, Rose May Ng or Rose Howe.
 "A-6737212, Huang, Yao Sien or Eva Yai-Sien Huang.
 "A-6576346, Jacobowitz, Bela (Jakobowitz).
 "A-6848236, Jacobowitz, Eva.
 "A-7197382, Jaszowski, Tadeusz or Ted Jaszowski or T. Jaszowski.
 "A-7427989, Karm, Meinhard.
 "A-6772233, Khalidi, Suleiman Faud El.
 "A-7491361, Kirilloff, Boris Ephim.
 "A-6887572, Kopelowitz, Ester (nee Tessler).
 "A-7178548, Laurik, Evald.
 "A-8091096, Lee, Margaret Chia Lin (Margaret Therese Lee).
 "A-6171207, Lee, Yiu Yung.
 "A-6953010, Lieber, Sarolta (nee Berger).
 "A-6851545, Loo, Ching Chee.
 "A-7135305, Loo, Chia-Ying Chang (nee Chang).
 "A-6819172, Masliyah, Noory Heskell or Noory Heskell Musaleh.
 "A-6467056, Metsalo, Valentin.
 "A-6415978, Molnar, Theresia.
 "A-6923768, Muller, Vera.
 "A-7095882, Munteanu, George Nicholas.
 "A-9107940, Nakielski, Bernard or Makielski.
 "A-8091555, Novak, Joakim Ante.
 "A-6801965, Pan, John Joel-Siang or John Pan.
 "A-6611055, Potocka, Maria.
 "A-9668080, Rand, Vladimir.
 "A-6776588, Rotbart, Motel.
 "A-7094824, Saltoun, Ishaq Heshel.
 "A-7841095, Saltoun, Raina.
 "A-7841096, Saltoun, Salum.
 "A-9825231, Scrivanich, Antonio Nicolo.
 "A-7048886, Shulman, Joel or Julian Shulman or Julian Shulman.
 "A-6606633, Spierer, William or William or Vilimos.
 "A-6508114, Stern, Herman.
 "A-9825170, Swidzinski, Czeslaw.
 "A-7144911, Swowsik, Emery Anthony or Emerich Antonin Swojsik.
 "A-7365957, Szekely, Suzanne.
 "A-6862642, Tessler, Margit (nee Margit Sonnenschein).
 "A-6258292, Tsai, Pe Chiu.
 "A-7934047, Tulk, Johannes.
 "A-7243463, Tye, Josephine Chou.
 "A-6990780, Wagner, Wienczyslaw Jozef.
 "A-6701080, Weiss, Rachel Ruth.
 "A-6881779, Weisz, Eva.
 "A-7134269, Wisniewski, Roxalla.
 "A-7197533, Woo, Kok Liang.
 "A-7197534, Woo, Lily Ji-Yuen.
 "A-7197535, Woo, Andy Ying-Chung.
 "A-7197536, Woo, Benny Fong-Chung.
 "A-6291894, Zydzorowicz, Zygmunt Stanislaw.
 "A-6291893, Zydzorowicz, Stanislaw (nee Babel) (Bombel).
 "A-6615482, Cimze, Brigita.
 "A-6619075, Sils, Jekabs Rudolfs.
 "A-6615484, Cimze, Wilhelmina Albertine (nee Upmanis).
 "A-7181293, Ambaras, Berek.
 "A-7181299, Ambaras, Ruchla Leja (nee Spector).
 "A-7181301, Ambaras, Szmil or Samuel.
 "A-7181300, Ambaras, Chaja.
 "A-6933862, Antos, Viktor or Viktor Adler.
 "A-7073948, Bajor, Laszlo.
 "A-7073949, Bajor, Margaret (nee Bermann).
 "A-7125348, Belohlavek, Ladislav.
 "A-8015690, Boni, Donata or Bonich.
 "A-7982580, Chen, Betty Shu-Hsien.
 "A-7350806, Chen, Chi-Cheng.
 "A-6542129, Deutsch, Emery.
 "A-6542128, Deutsch, Edith.
 "A-7395122, Dunn, Fung, Wen-Feng.
 "A-6899359, Elsendorf, Jente Perl.
 "A-7975403, Greisman, Chaim.
 "A-6933870, Greisman, Dyna (nee Dyna Stern).
 "A-6511086, Gulewski, Chaim Ber.
 "A-6843542, Halberstam, Serena.
 "A-7143248, Hauser, Moses.
 "A-6896010, Kac, David or David Katz.
 "A-6794615, Kahan, David.
 "A-6819107, Konig, Simon.
 "A-7383019, Konig, Judit.
 "A-6917988, Leffel, David.
 "A-7841092, Leffel, Hania Sarah Leffel.
 "A-7841094, Leffel, Henry.
 "A-7066379, Leicht, Alfred.
 "A-6757650, Liberman, Chaja Cross.
 "A-7057929, Loblovics, Jirina.
 "A-7445230, Loblovics, Peter Stepan.
 "A-9669698, Loser, Ladislav.
 "A-6439571, Lukacs, John Adalbert.
 "A-7184075, Nagy, Gustav.
 "A-6953276, Ostreicher, Sally or Sara Ostreicher.
 "A-9825173, Piccini, Giovanni or John Piccini.
 "A-9825233, Piccinich, Antonio.
 "A-9825234, Piccinich, Giovanni (John).
 "A-7048776, Pribramska, Milena Jaroslava.
 "A-6803937, Propper, Hinda.
 "A-7243272, Rofe, Clemy (nee Hassoun).
 "A-7243273, Rofe, Roland.
 "A-6542415, Ronikier, Adam.
 "A-6275646, Rosenthal, Cecilia Lucy (nee Rochlin).
 "A-6937373, Rottenberg, Laszlo.
 "A-6851434, Shen, Mary.
 "A-6441693, Shew, Lester Fook.
 "A-6441694, Shew, Alice Lee.
 "A-6450187, Shimanovsky, Alexander Eugene.
 "A-6450157, Shimanovsky, Xenia Niko-sevna.
 "A-6450158, Shimanovsky, Nikolai Alexander.
 "A-6450159, Shimanovsky, Natalie Alexander.
 "A-6905008, Strauss, Leo.
 "A-7863422, Strauss, Elizabeth (nee Elizabeth Brody).
 "A-7125300, Szilas, George.
 "A-7125301, Szilas, Veronica Anna.
 "A-6913912, Tabak, Guta.
 "A-9825237, Tarabocchia, Antonio Giovanni.
 "A-6805581, Teitelbaum, Dorothy.
 "A-7116390, Winter, Berek Litman.
 "A-7427544, Winter, Mordechai.
 "A-7802010, Zaharoff, George Alexander.
 "A-6659388, Zak, Irene Anna (nee Segal).
 "A-6663293, Zak, Daniel.
 "A-6663244, Zak, Michael.
 "A-6779061, Abdul-Nabi, Sion Moshli.
 "A-6907333, Abramczyk, Abram.
 "A-7074032, Blumenstein, Jerta.
 "A-6509235, Brecher, Samuel.
 "A-6703334, Chang, Joyce Loretta.
 "A-6848604, Chien, James Tai Tze.
 "A-7975994, Chiu, Leung.
 "A-9836671, Cymer, Alfred or Alfred Ziemer or Alfred K. Cymer or Cymer Alfred or A. Cymer.
 "A-7934149, D'Antoni, Giuseppe Giovanni.
 "A-6949998, Dresdner, Desider.
 "A-6983006, Felkay, Miklos.
 "A-6983007, Felkay, Magdalena.
 "A-7445428, Felkay, Julia Agnes.
 "A-6496385, Fischman, Moses.
 "A-6472344, Fischman, Piri (nee Jeremias).
 "A-9765956, Fook, Lum or Lam.
 "A-6390069, Gerencser, Frank.
 "A-6390070, Gerencser, Anne.
 "A-7132030, Goldberger, Ernest.
 "A-6929650, Gorodecki, Aba.
 "A-6480449, Gorog, Frigyes or Frederic Gorog.
 "A-7125154, Gorog, Margit.
 "A-6887741, Gunsburg, Mendel.
 "A-6666944, Halberfeld, Eugene.
 "A-6922074, Halpert, Mendel.
 "A-7491705, Ho, Hao Jo.
 "A-7828496, Ho, Hsiang-Chiao Huang.
 "A-7828498, Ho, Lily Li-Lien.
 "A-7828495, Ho, Louise Li-Si.
 "A-7828597, Ho, William Wei-Yu.
 "A-7125390, Iritz, Magda.
 "A-7354858, Iritz, Andras Ferenc.
 "A-6438637, Jurisovic, Milo Tripe.
 "A-6438638, Jurisovic, Jelena Milo.
 "A-6438640, Jurisovic, Radmila Milo.
 "A-6438639, Jurisovic, Svetozar Milo.
 "A-6987919, Karastoyanova, Marguita Bogdanova.
 "A-7056457, Karcz, Jerzy Feliks.
 "A-7097876, Karcz, Irena.
 "A-7134826, Karlik, Oldrich (Olda) Evse Spithnev.
 "A-7095980, Kovacs, Iona Marie (nee To-volgyi).
 "A-7095981, Kovacs, Judith Iona.
 "A-7095982, Kovacs, Katalin Piroksa.
 "A-6847906, Keng, Hilda Hsi Ling.
 "A-9506160, Kingsepp, Alexander.
 "A-7210424, Kotas, Jindrich.
 "A-7197295, Kucera, Sonia or Sonia Kucerova.
 "A-7802992, Kun, Jozsef Lajos or Joseph Kun.
 "A-9290474, Lian, Choo Joon.
 "A-6709345, Kwong, Tin Yu.
 "A-6991771, Leidermann, Susan Veronica.
 "A-6985787, Leidermann, Paul.
 "A-6848564, Lin, Ru-Kan or Ru Kong Lin.
 "A-8001257, Ljubic, Maria Luca.
 "A-7210293, Madis Voldemar.
 "A-7210288, Madis Iona.
 "A-7863133, Madis, Iona, Jr.
 "A-7863134, Madis, Voldemar, Jr.
 "A-7991037, Maram, Maria.
 "A-7629040, Michalski, Stefan Antoni.
 "A-6555835, Milikowski, Boruch, or Milikowsky or Boruch Milikowsky or Milikowski or Bouch Milikowski or Borouch Milikowski.

- "A-7483287, Moy, Don Tsit.
 "A-7095886, Miculescu, Mircea.
 "A-6849839, Nieh, Tseng-Lu.
 "A-6852886, Ostteicher, Ester or Esther (nee Perlestein).
 "A-7868150, Pi, Teh Ho.
 "A-9825275, Piccini, Matteo.
 "A-7201404, Ripka, George Prokop.
 "A-7863155, Ripka, Hubert Jean Michel or Hubert Jan Michal Ripka.
 "A-6704266, Romanowska, Alicja Theresa or Alice Romanowski.
 "A-6983560, Setton, Renee Albert.
 "A-6746537, Shina, Isaac Saleh.
 "A-9825384, Tarabochia, John.
 "A-6403591, Tkachenko, Arkady.
 "A-7142101, Twardon, Gerard Edward.
 "A-7828393, Veres, George Stephen.
 "A-7828395, Veres, Catherine Renee.
 "A-7828394, Veres, Paul Stephen.
 "A-7095791, Vizer, Jozsef or Joseph.
 "A-7095792, Vizer, Erzsébet or Elizabeth (nee Papa).
 "A-7264780, Pal, Peter or Paul Vizer.
 "A-7915647, Wang, King-Ching.
 "A-7354350, Wang, Shen Kuang.
 "A-7379754, Wang, Chao-Chih Shih.
 "A-6622376, Wang, Shih Jien.
 "A-7427597, Yang, Bernard Kenneth.
 "A-7248107, Yu, Fu Ching.
 "A-6699842, Choye, James Hung or Tsai Hung.
 "A-6933906, Feder, Solomon.
 "A-7052513, Feher, Janos.
 "A-7052514, Feher, Klara (nee Vajda).
 "A-7052515, Feher, Agnes, Julianna.
 "A-7053576, Friend, Jacob Lion.
 "A-6159672, Hudec, Ladislav Edward.
 "A-6159673, Hudec, Gisella Isabella.
 "A-6903729, Irany, Jalal Zand.
 "A-6704668, Jacob, Ellis Samuel.
 "A-9778010, Kaplur, Serge Michael.
 "A-9506849, Klak, Tadeusz Boleslaw.
 "A-7052354, Kremnitzer, Samuel.
 "A-7898806, Kremnitzer, Sala.
 "A-7298969, Ku, Ta Hai.
 "A-7350229, Kurzenbaum, Konstantin Paul.
 "A-1804133, Lillo, Rudolf Karl.
 "A-6460280, Lis, Josef Lisek Vel.
 "A-6071234, Liu, James Hsi-Hwa.
 "A-9825110, Maslobojew, Ryszard.
 "A-7356260, Metes, Mircea Virgil P.
 "A-7809812, Nacinovich, Francesco Giovanni.
 "A-9831492, Paszek, Emil.
 "A-7249625, Quon, Yuk Lum or Egai Kim Quon.
 "A-6704260, Rymarska, Stanislaw Janina or Stella Rymarski.
 "A-7197296, Schwarzenberg, Francis (Franciszek).
 "A-7197297, Schwarzenberg, Amalie (Amalia).
 "A-7809033, Schwarzenberg, Ludmila.
 "A-6982895, Sevcik, Jaromir.
 "A-7809012, Siao, Ruby Wang.
 "A-7809013, Siao, Lilly.
 "A-5206882, Silla, Johannes.
 "A-6992868, Sion, Caroline Eliahou (nee Caroline Eliahou Khazzam).
 "A-6943745, Somogyi, John.
 "A-6985795, Stransky, Frank.
 "A-6985796, Stransky, Kamila.
 "A-9716791, Strawinski, Adolf.
 "A-9825125, Szymankiewicz, Kazimierz.
 "A-6844603, Wang, Kung-Lee.
 "A-6848123, Yen, Jen Hwa (Moore Yen).
 "A-9766047, Abelnicks, Karlis Alexandris.
 "A-6763814, Ahmad, Abder Raouf Sayied.
 "A-9621982, Baric, Slavko.
 "A-9825347, Bresaz, Metodjo Vittorio.
 "A-7201326, Chao, Margaret Ellen.
 "A-6868652, Chasan, Samuel.
 "A-6843905, Chasan, Lala.
 "A-6843906, Chasan, Daniel.
 "A-6665493, Djordjevich, Ilija Milan or Eli M. Georgevich.
 "A-6363788, Dwek, Joseph.
 "A-9825078, Geba, Wacław Stanislaw.
 "A-6857645, Gedeon, William Jabra.
 "A-7176712, Geiger, Leslie alias Lelsie Laselo Geiger.
 "A-7197556, Geiger, Elizabeth nee Elizabeth Klein alias Elisabeth Kozmo.
 "A-6870411, Gottlieb, Suzanna Gabriella.
 "A-6829523, Hofer, Andras or Andre or Andrew or Andre, Fernand, Francois Hofer; Andras Nandor Ferenc Hofer.
 "1100-23457, Huang, Yuan Chung or Wei Ta Huang or Walter Huang.
 "A-6652842, Kenigsberg, Szaia Abram.
 "A-7144083, Lederman, Abram.
 "A-6923751, Lewita, Pinkas.
 "A-7903765, Mikulich, Gildo (nee Ermine-gildo Miculich).
 "A-6819103, Pick, Teresa Zeller.
 "A-6555822, Rosenstein, Muzza.
 "A-6987833, Sebestyen, George Stephen.
 "A-7941803, Simichich, Giovanni.
 "A-9825228, Tarabochia, Antonio.
 "A-6881776, Traube, Moses.
 "A-6949360, Traube, Frida Pessa.
 "A-6848504, Tsou, Kwan Shung or Tsou Kwan Chung.
 "A-6983523, Visolanu, Florica Corneliu (nee Balteanu).
 "A-8001252, Wei, Chue Sue.
 "A-7118818, Winkler, Thomas.
 "A-9634634, Adamson, Armand.
 "A-7074001, Alimanestiano, Mihai.
 "A-7052865, Alimanestiano, Ioana.
 "A-7118760, Blau, Sidonia (nee Weiss).
 "A-6953297, Brod, Ivan.
 "A-6739686, Chao, Pei Chu.
 "A-6973682, Chang, Linda Tung-Chen.
 "A-7111908, Chiao, Gene Liang.
 "A-7111909, Chiao, Wei Ying Lin.
 "A-6522482, Chou, Kuo-P'ing alias Ch'iao-Chin Chou (or Chow), alias Shou-Ying Chou (or Chow) alias Hsien-Chen Chou (or Chow).
 "A-6921258, Deutsch, Joel.
 "A-6595663, Druker, Haim Girsch.
 "A-6595664, Druker, Rebecca Afraim.
 "A-6595662, Druker, Leah alias Lillian Druker.
 "A-6854411, Fabry, Gavriella.
 "A-7135698, Fan, Kwan Chi alias Quincey Chi-Chun Fan.
 "A-6897918, Faybik, Alojz Stefan alias Allen Stefan Faybik.
 "A-6945554, Froemel, Robert Boris Ivan-chenko.
 "A-6968029, Goldstein, Margarita Martin.
 "A-7395111, Hu, Helen or Yu Hsin Hu.
 "A-6851699, Huang, William Yung-Nien alias William Edward Huang.
 "A-7141717, Izsak, Julianna.
 "A-7279652, Izsak, Robert John.
 "A-6771471, Karkar, Ya'qub (Jack) Nasif.
 "A-7985654, Kask, Johannes alias Johannes Kask.
 "A-7178540, Kask, Nelly (nee Jarg) alias N. Jarg or Nelli Jarg or Nellie Jarg or Millie Jarg or Nellie Jarge or Nelly Jarg Kask.
 "A-7863386, King, Peter Wei Kong.
 "A-6930672, Kramer, Esther or Ester.
 "A-6279271, Landau, Judith.
 "A-6521591, Loutchan, Ludmila Maria.
 "A-7125164, Lowinger, Ida (nee Ida Klein).
 "A-9914609, Pusic, Paul.
 "A-9825124, Puzska, Jan.
 "A-7184152, Radnai, Pal Andras alias Paul Andrew Radnai.
 "A-7197543, Radnai, Eva (nee Eva Balazs).
 "A-7383442, Sakin, Anna (nee Boxer).
 "A-7383443, Sakin, Shulamith.
 "A-7383444, Sakin, Judith.
 "A-7178370, Sihv, Eduard (or E.; or Edward Sihv; or Eduard Shlv).
 "A-6183233, Tamm, Igor.
 "A-9580292, Toomberg, Valdemar.
 "A-7057641, Treblinska, Rywka alias Rywka Treblinski or Regina Treblinski, or Hochs-ztein (nee Treblinska).
 "A-7967275, Tung, Chen Huan.
 "A-7398350, Vall, Eduard Julius.
 "A-6922682, Winkler, Sandor.
 "A-7046213, Winkler, Margit (nee Szerou).
 "A-6790612, Wu, Chien Keng.
 "A-9825045, Swiderski, Romuald.
 "A-6916445, Ulm, Arvo Johannes.
 "A-6779243, Schildof-Vojnovic, Ivan, or Ivan Schildof.
 "A-7079927, Weiss, Bernat, or Bernard Weiss.
 "A-6354566, Krajden, Moszko.
 "A-6849467, Skarzynska, Aniela, or Irena Merenholtz.
 "A-5534198, Zombory, Ladislav.
 "A-7941170, Chong, King Kee, or Kee Chong King or Casey King.
 "A-7786119, Gorski, Boleslaw Pawel.
 "A-6862321, Adamus, Stanislaw.
 "A-7193792, Kulej, Hanna Teresa.
 "A-7193793, Cholewicki, Victor Stefan.
 "A-9677603, Aasma, August.
 "A-7129220, Aurel, Mozes.
 "A-6903692, Bluth, Lenke Einhorn.
 "A-6861310, Chao, Hieh Chang, or Frank Chao.
 "A-6852888, Feldbrand, Mancl.
 "A-7868117, Frank, Frieda.
 "A-6887552, Ickowicz, Majer.
 "A-6983574, Indig, Abraham.
 "A-7841098, Indig, Irene.
 "A-7052337, Levendel, Irene.
 "A-6691413, Lin, Shuh Yuen, alias Shuh Yuen Liu.
 "A-6794943, Malhas, Ruhi Abdul-Hamid.
 "A-6612875, Masri, Mahmud Said.
 "A-6887709, Meisels, Naftali.
 "A-7190317, Molostvoff, Catherine Basil.
 "A-7125385, Nowomiast, Mojzesz, Hirsz, alias Marvin Henry Newton.
 "A-7125386, Nowomiast, Mina (nee Kaplan), alias Mina Newton.
 "A-7841884, Nowomiast, Mark, alias Mark Newton.
 "A-8001241, Petelka, Zofia (nee Korpowska).
 "A-7427649, Rzepkowicz, Michael.
 "A-7390586, Sedlak, Mirko Svatopluk, or Mirko Sedlak.
 "A-4768149, Shu, E. Hah.
 "A-7048743, Stern, Martin.
 "A-7124129, Tan, Pai Chu.
 "A-9766004, Toomepuu, Juhan.
 "A-9766003, Toomepuu, Juri.
 "A-6163781, Tsai, Chen Yu.
 "A-7144079, Wolf, Aron Nathan.
 "A-6862641, Adam, Mozes.
 "A-6440636, Aizer, Salim Shaoul.
 "A-5876212, Ambrus, Jan.
 "A-8001260, Arro, Arnold.
 "A-6952382, Beer, Adam, Eugen.
 "A-7210292, Bekefi, Laszlo, alias Leslie Bekefi.
 "A-7210291, Bekefi, Magdalena.
 "A-6967636, Chen, Paul Kuan Yao.
 "A-7483958, Cheng, Ai Ming.
 "A-7483959, Chen, Lilly Li.
 "A-9765114, Cieslak, Alfons.
 "A-6662080, Domb, Jerachmiel, alias Jerachmiel Donn.
 "A-6805594, Faber, Laszlo, alias Laszlo Theodore Faber and George Leslie Faber.
 "A-6567671, Friedman, Leopold.
 "A-6903791, Gilbert, Suzanne, alias Suzanne Goldberger.
 "A-6737204, Godkin, Michael Joseph, or Moses Joseph Godkin.
 "A-7049993, Hazzan, Leon Isaac.
 "A-7049994, Hazzan, Renee.
 "A-6862650, Herman, Michel.
 "A-6991850, Herman, Maria.
 "A-6887727, Horowitz, Majer.
 "A-7276014, Hwang, Lai-Yin Grace.
 "A-6985811, Ionnituu, Mircea.
 "A-6903748, Kaftanski, Seymour, alias Szepsel Kaftanski.
 "A-6390210, Kangro, Valdeko.
 "A-7085991, Kassab, David Jacob.
 "A-6627380, Kiang, Frederica Shu-Ya.
 "A-9635272, Kiploks, Ludvigs, Paul or Ludvigs Kiploks.
 "A-6922685, Klein, Moric.
 "A-7828455, Klein, Julie.
 "A-7828456, Klein, Tomas.
 "A-6386367, Kogerman, Sulev Kristjan.
 "56133/591, Kuljaca, Jovo Petro.
 "A-6847740, Kwong, Man Hong.
 "A-7087401, Lautman, Zoltan.
 "A-6983796, Lee, Joseph Alexander.
 "A-6694226, Li, Kuan.
 "A-6625627, Li, Frances.
 "A-6794979, Lieber, Leopold.

"A-6794944, Loh, Ellen (Ai Lien Loh, Ellen Lo).

"A-7757809, Loo, Ping Yok.

"A-6995548, Lowy, Gustav.

"A-6805570, Odinak, Alec (Elya Odinak).

"A-6373385, Petrova, Olga Gregorie.

"A-6904771, Pizyc, Stefa.

"A-6934637, Popoff, Sergei Vasilievich.

"A-6390227, Raid, Kaljo, alias Kaljo Raa-mann.

"A-7073587, Rizk, George Sliman, formerly George Sliman Rizk Abu Judom.

"A-7463362, Sabel, Bela.

"A-7463363, Sabel, Ilona (nee Adler).

"A-7903795, Sabel, Irene.

"A-6771472, Salah, Nadim John.

"A-6938007, Schwartz, Hillel Aron.

"A-7243320, Shalom, Yacoub Raphael, alias Jack Raphael Shalom.

"A-6867165, Sommerstein, Emil.

"A-6886844, Szeto, Shih-Chuan.

"A-7290210, Sztachman, Aleksander.

"A-9734415, Tai, Ying Wah.

"A-6983820, Taub, Ladislav Basile, alias Lawrence Taub.

"A-6628885, Vaughan, Nellie Ladd.

"A-7752326, Wang, Chi-Yuan.

"A-6849833, Wang, Virginia Fu-Chuang.

"A-6904341, Wechsler, Samuel.

"A-6886824, Weiss, Josef.

"A-6844256, Wenger, Irving (Israel Wegler).

"A-6844257, Wenger, Ida (Chaja Wegler).

"A-7130820, Berland, Felicia, alias Felicia Berland.

"A-7182346, Borowiec, Andrzej Stanislaw.

"A-9758751, Bracco, Giovanni.

"A-7139089, Bracco, Simon Guisto.

"A-8057048, Cugliani, John, or Ivan Kuljanic or Ivan Milan Kuljanic.

"A-7046293, David, Masouda M. S. S.

"A-7139010, Deblinger, Srul.

"A-6959748, Deblinger, Kate (nee Guttman).

"A-7934151, Fable, Joseph, or Joe Fable.

"A-7079925, Fulop, Jenő.

"A-7144001, Goldberger, Magdalena.

"A-6528723, Halpern, Aron.

"A-6159671, Joles, Joel Leib.

"A-6737779, Klein, Moritz.

"A-6891804, Kohn, Judith.

"A-6755538, Liang Tsch.

"A-7779160, Loo, Shou Ming.

"A-6949995, Neufeld, Josef.

"0300-299946, Paama, Ernest.

"A-7244193, Picinich, Matteo.

"A-7123477, Rawicki, Jerzy Jacob, alias Jerry Rawicki.

"A-7276711, Sang, Chang Chuan.

"A-6934990, Schnabel, Moses.

"A-7285778, Surian, Giovanni.

"A-6849828, Tai, Gertrude Loe or Hsiao Tso Loe.

"A-6620485, Tsang, John Lien-Kwei.

"A-9555577, Velder, Carl (Karl) Alfred.

"A-7118759, Weiss, Ervin, alias Erwin Weiss.

"A-7118778, Weiss, Frieda.

"A-6238175, Yang, Peter Quay, also known as Yang Quay and Yang Kwei.

"A-6210613, Litynski, Zygmunt Leopold or Zygmunt Litynski.

"A-7383205, Ilescu, Dumitru.

"A-6405961, Lin, Chi-Sun."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

WILLIAM LANGER,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,

RUTH THOMPSON,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

gressional approval for adjustment of the immigration status of certain aliens who have established that they are displaced persons residing in the United States within the purview of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended. Included in the concurrent resolution, as agreed to by the House of Representatives, were 509 cases. The Senate committee deleted from the concurrent resolution the names of 27 aliens because upon the basis of the then available information it did not appear that there were sufficiently strong equities in the 27 cases to warrant the granting of the status of permanent residence. Upon reconsideration of the merits involved in each individual case, the conferees have agreed to reinstate 11 names which were deleted from the concurrent resolution by the Senate and to sustain the action taken by the Senate in 16 cases. In addition, three cases which were transmitted to the committees by the Attorney General have been added to the concurrent resolution.

Accordingly, Mr. President, the conferees on the part of the Senate do recommend and I hereby move that the Senate adopt the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 29.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

FARM PRICES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the subject of farm prices. I believe that the level of farm prices this year and next will have much more to do with a balanced budget next year, or the year after, than any other thing we are discussing on the floor of the Senate today. Go back as far as we want, at least 35 years, and we shall find that our national income is always approximately seven times that of our farm income. The prices of our basic raw materials are important to our national economy and have a direct relationship to it.

The many attacks on our present farm price-support program are completely unwarranted. For the most part, these attacks are based on misinformation and a complete lack of knowledge and understanding of these price-support programs. They are directed mainly against our present 90 percent price-support program for basic farm commodities. Incidentally, over the past 20 years of their operation, the price-support programs have netted the Federal Government a profit of \$4 million.

Prices of practically all farm commodities continue their drastic downward trend. The average price that all commodities are selling for at the present time is less than 93 percent of parity. Many commodities, and particularly grains and feed grains, are selling at less than 85 percent of parity. While this downward trend in farm prices continues, the prices of most commodities and services that the farmers have to buy remain at their all time high, and there is every indication that the prices of some of these goods and services may increase even further. There have been important wage increases and pension

benefits granted to some organized labor groups this week.

The situation we are facing today is not too unlike that which prevailed in 1929 just before the great depression. If history repeats itself, as it has many times in the past, our present greatly reduced farm income could well lead to another and even more severe depression. If we are to avert another depression, it will require bold action on the part of the United States Government to maintain at least a fair level of farm prices.

Ninety percent farm price supports, according to many of our most reputable economists, prevented the expected post World War II depression. These price-support programs, properly administered, can and will go a long way toward preventing another depression. At least part of their effectiveness has already been destroyed by unwise attacks by high officials in the present administration. These attacks, based for the most part on lack of understanding or information, have already destroyed the confidence of the American people in the future price structure.

Many of the speeches opposing the present price-support program are reminiscent of those we heard in and out of Congress during the sessions of 1949 and 1950. It will be recalled that at that time, Mr. President, many predicted that the agricultural surpluses we had then would destroy our price-support program and wreck our economy. We had some sizable carryovers of important agricultural commodities at that time—more than we have presently.

I wonder how many Members of the Senate recall that it was only a short while ago—1951, to be specific—when we were encountering not only a United States shortage of many important farm commodities but a worldwide shortage. In fact, during 1951, we saw the imposition of price ceilings on cotton and the skyrocketing of cotton prices throughout the world. Many of the textile industries, particularly in Europe, still have not completely recovered from the results of the short cotton supply and resultant high prices of that period just a short while ago. A similar situation prevailed with respect to the short supplies and resultant higher prices of many other farm commodities.

The Government of the United States, realizing the importance of maintaining sizable supplies of important raw materials in a continued tense world situation, has been stockpiling under a war emergency program important commodities such as copper, aluminum, asbestos, lead, mercury, nickel, quinine, crude rubber, tin, tungsten, diamond dyes, pepper, wool, and even castor oil. No less important than the need of stockpiling these materials has been the need to maintain sizable stocks of basic farm commodities, including cotton, corn, and wheat. These commodities, however, rather than being stockpiled under a separate program, as is the case with other strategic war materials, have been carried as surplus stockpiles under the Commodity Credit Corporation and the farm-price-support program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, House Concurrent Resolution 29 records con-

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has said that they had a right to stockpile, even when the prices were going down.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it was a very necessary program.

Mr. MAYBANK. But they did not stockpile, except, as the Senator has suggested, through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. There was practically no wheat or cotton stockpiled.

Mr. YOUNG. The stockpiles which were maintained meant a surplus beyond our normal carryover of these commodities, which had the effect of demoralizing prices.

Mr. MAYBANK. The surpluses were a part of the program of the Department of Agriculture. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture went from pillar to post, I may say, urging the farmer to increase his production. Is not that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. And Congress removed the controls.

Mr. YOUNG. The Department of Agriculture is asking farmers to increase their corn production at this time.

There is no attack being made upon the stockpiling of strategic war materials, except our agricultural commodities. This in spite of the fact the Government of the United States has continually year after year been asking farmers to produce more of many of these commodities. The Government of the United States is asking the corn farmers of this Nation, for example, to increase their corn production this year for the third consecutive year.

While the corn farmers are being asked to increase their corn production by the Department of Agriculture, its Secretary, Mr. Benson, at the same time has been pointing out in speech after speech the serious problem we have of corn and other surpluses. The present price support law provides among other things that our normal carryover of wheat is considered to be approximately 150 million bushels. A 150 million bushel carryover, in my opinion, and I believe most everyone else's, is an inadequate amount under our present and past unsettled world situation. Either the 150 million bushel carryover as provided under our price support legislation should be increased or wheat and other strategic farm commodities should be stockpiled under a separate program.

We read many statements by supposedly responsible people expressing alarm over our present supplies of basic farm commodities, particularly wheat, cotton, and corn. Mr. President, I have obtained what I believe to be accurate information from the United States Department of Agriculture on our present Commodity Credit Corporation holdings of farm commodities and their obligations under CCC loans which are outstanding.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire table may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, but I would like to read some of these figures into

the RECORD and comment on them, as I believe they present an entirely different picture from what many persons would have us believe.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation investments in price-support operations and outstanding obligations to advance funds (including inventories, loans held by Commodity Credit Corporation, loans held by lending agencies, loans in process, purchase agreements)—Peak figures for each year

Fiscal year:

1948, December (1947)-----	\$565,400,000
1949, June (1949)-----	2,692,500,000
1950, February (1950)-----	4,231,100,000
1951, July (1950)-----	3,502,900,000
1952, October (1951)-----	2,041,300,000
1953, as of Mar. 31, 1953----	3,267,500,000

Source: CCC, USDC.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in 1949 the total obligations under the Commodity Credit Corporation, including inventories, loans held by Commodity Credit Corporation, loans held by lending agencies, loans in process, and purchase agreements, amounted to \$2,692,500,000.

In 1950 the holdings amounted to \$4,231,100,000.

In 1951 they amounted to \$3,502,900,000.

That is considerably higher than it is at the present time.

In 1952 the amount was \$2,041,300,000. As of March 31, 1953, it was \$3,267,500,000.

That is approximately a billion dollars less than it was in 1950.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. We hear complaints about the farmers being subsidized. We are going to consider in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the appropriation of millions of dollars to subsidize maritime interests. I cannot understand why some persons who are interested in such subsidies should complain about the farmer having a right to borrow money, which he generally pays back, and at the same time Congress appropriates countless millions of dollars to keep American ships on the seas. Of course, they should be kept on the seas. But I cannot understand how such persons can complain about the farmers receiving credit.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator for his comment; all the more so since he is one of the best friends agriculture has in the Senate.

If we want to go into the question of subsidies, I think every other segment of our economy enjoys more subsidies than do our farmers.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Postmaster General made one of the best statements before the Appropriations Committee a few days ago that I have ever heard, when he said, in effect, that we were subsidizing all classes of mail except one or two classes. He admitted that we were subsidizing too much.

Mr. YOUNG. We are spending at the present time approximately \$1,900,000,000 a year in research by industry. Approximately 47 percent of that amount is provided by United States Government

appropriations. The total amount we spend in agricultural research is approximately \$50 million to \$60 million.

Mr. MAYBANK. As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the Senator knows that appropriations for agricultural research have been reduced. I have never heard any complaint about the fairness and equity of the research program carried on by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. President, it will be noted, among other things, that both our inventory of farm commodities which we hold under the CCC and the outstanding loans under the Price Support Program are considerably less than they were in 1949 and 1950.

In recent weeks we have witnessed attacks by not only other than farm people, but by some groups of our farm economy themselves against our present price-support program for grains and particularly feed grains. This despite the fact that according to the Department of Agriculture practically all feed grains were selling, as of April 15, 1953, at a national average below 85 percent of parity. The cash corn price, as of April 15, 1953, on a national average was selling at 82 percent of parity; oats at 86 percent of parity, and wheat at 85 percent of parity. Cash grain prices are even lower at the present time. Oats, for example, on Saturday, May 23, sold at Bismarck, N. Dak., for 49 cents a bushel. This is 20 cents a bushel below the support price which is 85 percent of parity. In other words, cash oats in my State are selling at not more than 70 percent of parity.

Mr. President, during the past several weeks some cattle producers and cattle feeders have made demands upon the Department of Agriculture to make available corn and other feeds at lower prices than are now obtainable on the cash markets. This is despite the fact that corn and most feed grains are selling at 83 percent of parity or less. These interests are expressing opposition to the present price-support program for grains.

Last year we had similar requests from some hog feeders who wanted cheaper corn to offset their losses resulting from the demoralized hog prices at that time. Corn prices were maintained at 90 percent of parity despite these requests. At the present time we have a very favorable hog price and normal supplies of hogs.

If corn and other feed prices had been lowered a year ago to meet the demands of hog feeders, it would have resulted in continued heavy feeding and production of hogs and a continued oversupply with demoralized hog prices. A lowering of corn prices to a year ago would have accelerated even more the cattle feeding operations with a net result of even more burdensome surpluses of cattle today. As bad as the cattle price situation is, it would have been immeasurably worse if corn prices had been lowered a year ago as requested by some of our agricultural interests. Cattle producers, as well as other farm producers, I believe are entitled to price protection. It would be

unreasonable, however, to expect grain prices to be lowered even more to meet their demands.

In substance, such demands mean that these producers expect the grain producers to subsidize their operations. The problems of our agricultural economy can best be served by all of our agricultural interests working together.

If we are to maintain a stable economy in this Nation, we are going to have to give greater protection to the prices of farm commodities and not less. To those who advocate still lower price supports for our basic farm commodities, and the resultant still lower prices that would automatically follow, are following directly in the footsteps of those who controlled the policies of the Government of the United States during the late twenties and early thirties. To follow that line of thinking under present conditions when we have a debt-ridden, topheavy economy would lead us directly and speedily toward another and disastrous depression.

Mr. President, at the present time agriculture is in a serious situation. To retain any semblance of solvency for agriculture and the Nation as a whole will require more sympathetic understanding of farm problems and some direct action. It involves not only maintaining a high level of price supports for farm commodities, but, equally important, more protection than we have on imports of more cheaply produced foreign agricultural commodities.

According to the best information I have, in the spring wheat areas the farmers have increased their wheat acreage and planting, and have reduced the number of acres of feed grains and particularly oats. The reason is simple. Oats and feed grain prices are for the most part below the cost of production. Oats prices could be at a fair level now if the past had taken action or the present administration would take the necessary action to at least curb heavy imports. I tried in vain to get the previous administration to take action to curb these imports, but with no success. The present Secretary, Mr. Benson, indicates that he desires to do something about these imports. I am patiently waiting for results.

Mr. President, let me give you just one example of why it is impossible for United States farmers to compete price-wise with Canadian farmers on feed grains. Taxes, labor, transportation, and many other costs in Canada are much lower than in the United States. The Canadian Government, because it is practically out of debt, has found it possible to eliminate certain taxes that are burdensome in America and reduce many others. Here are some startling figures on transportation costs in Canada as against the United States. The rail rate from Regina, Saskatchewan, to Fort William is 6.4 cents per bushel on oats. The rate from Crosby, N. Dak., which is directly across the line from Regina, is 15.87 cents per bushel to Duluth, Minn., which is comparable to Fort William on the Canadian side.

The freight rate from Sweet Grass, Mont.—including tax—is 45.3 cents a bushel on wheat to Duluth. The freight

rate directly across the line at Coumts, Alberta, to Fort William is 16 cents per bushel for wheat.

Mr. President, this is one of the many reasons why United States farmers cannot compete price-wise with Canadian imports of grains.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. First, I wish to compliment my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from North Dakota, for the very challenging address he is giving. Then I wish to associate myself especially with the point he has just made about the necessity of maintaining adequate import tariffs on certain agricultural products, if our price-support program is to succeed. If our price-support program fails, America will be plunged into depression.

I believe it is now clearly understood among all economists in the country that when depressions originate with the farmers they eventually ramify and bring about a national depression. If we reduce by 25 or 30 percent the income of the farmers of America under our existing schedules of fixed charges we shall plunge the country into economic chaos. So when we talk about a price-support program for the farmer we are talking about a price-support program for our whole prosperity level.

May I inquire whether the Senator from North Dakota agrees with me that when we talk about a protective tariff program for American agriculture, we are not asking for anything for agriculture which is not now enjoyed by American industry?

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that the good way to bring that point to the attention of fair-minded citizens is to talk about barley. The tariff on a bushel of barley, which produces the equivalent of a barrel of beer, is 7½ cents. The farmer gets protection of 7½ cents a bushel.

I wish we had time to engage in some conjecture in the Senate as to what industry receives as its share from a bushel of barley, so that we might realize just how the farmer is being victimized by the inadequate, dishonest import tariff policy, because breweries in the United States, on every barrel of beer produced from every bushel of barley, enjoy a tariff of \$3.80 per barrel. That means they receive a 50-to-1 preference over the American farmer. I know of no one who alleges that the economic success of the brewing industry is essential to the economic prosperity of the United States, whereas any student of American economics must realize that the overall economic prosperity of the farmer is essential to overall American prosperity.

I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota will agree with me that no more important fiscal problem confronts the country or the Congress today than the working out of a program which will give to the farmer his fair share of the national income and the kind of tariff protection he requires, so that the price support program can work, because if the price support program breaks down,

America will be headed for economic disaster, despite anything else we may do.

Mr. YOUNG. I could not more heartily agree with the Senator. I have often admired the studies the Senator from South Dakota has made of agricultural economics, especially of the prices farmers receive for their commodities and how those prices affect the entire economy. I deeply appreciate the Senator's comments.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from North Dakota has made a generous contribution to the thinking of America.

I am happy to see on the floor the very distinguished, able, and energetic chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who is listening with his usual rapt attention. Our committee is just now concluding a long series of hearings on important problems confronting agriculture. I hope those hearings may merge into legislative methods by which we can solve the problems that have been very definitely exposed.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, the prices which the producers of farm commodities and all other raw materials receive are so basic to the prosperity of the whole Nation that we simply cannot permit farm prices to slip further. If we are to maintain national prosperity and solvency, it will require a sympathetic understanding of our present administration with respect not only to the price of all farm commodities, but also to the price-support program which has been almost entirely responsible for preventing an even more serious situation.

Mr. President, I believe the 83d Congress will not adjourn next year until it has extended our present price-support program or legislate an even better program than now exists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks a part of a letter which I have received from M. W. Thatcher, general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn. His is a very excellent letter bearing on the entire agricultural situation, including price supports and the effects of heavy foreign imports.

There being no objection, the portions of the letter referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL
ASSOCIATION,

St. Paul, Minn., May 13, 1953.

The Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MILT: I am very glad to have your recent letter, giving me copies of letters to you from Secretary Benson. I am particularly interested in the approach through which our Government is discussing these grain imports with the officials in Canada.

The discussions relate to oats. We have a deeper interest in barley and rye than we do in oats, particularly barley. Today, there is just no market for our barley—I mean there is no market. In order to move any substantial barley today, we would have to offer terminal elevator barley at a discount of from 5 to 10 cents per bushel under the current sluggish price for fresh country run receipts.

The maltsters simply sit in a laughing position in the situation. They have complete buying control because of the large supply

of malting barley in Canada. Naturally, the Canadians want to sell their surplus barley, and naturally, the maltsters want to buy malting barley as cheaply as they can. In the early marketing last fall, we had good malting barley prices. Just as soon as the Canadian barley crop was made and some malting barley showed up, our maltsters started importing it and tearing down our price structure. We can't even get parity for premium malting barley.

We have a deficient crop in rye. Yet, the price is way off, and again, it is the Canadian rye that does it.

I can't understand a Secretary of Agriculture, responsible for the administration of programs that seek to achieve parity for agriculture, showing the attitude that has prevailed down there last year and this year. The whole theory of support prices is to help farmers get a reasonable price on commodities that are raised in surplus. The purpose of the laws is clear. Tremendous funds from the taxpayers' money are used in supporting these programs. If we had no surpluses, we would not need price supports. But, we do have surpluses. We do need price supports. And, we use price supports.

Why then, permit the importation of surplus commodities from Canada to come in here and further aggravate our surplus accumulations? The greater the surplus in the hands of the Government, the greater the cost, the greater the publicity about it, which means a couple of black eyes to our price support program. To permit a continuation of the importation of the unneeded surpluses from Canada makes the Government look stupid, particularly the Secretary of Agriculture. It flagrantly defeats the purpose of the legislation and constitutes both an economic loss to the Federal Treasury and imposes an unjustified burden on the farmers in carrying out international trade. Further, it is a betrayal of everything promised to and expected by our grain growers.

We have import quotas on wheat for human consumption. We use quotas in the cotton program. We use quotas, subsidies, and regimentation in the sugar program. Will you tell me what economic sense it makes to use quotas on some of these commodities and deny them on feed wheat, oats, barley, and rye? Who can defend such inconsistency and lack of fairness as to one group of farmers as compared to another? Tell me anyone who can defend it. Tell me anyone who can defend imposing a tariff of \$3.83 on a barrel of beer and then impose a tariff of 7½ cents on a bushel of malting barley, which is the equivalent of a barrel of beer. It looks to me as though the breweries are protected by \$3.83 a barrel as against the American farmer raising malting barley with a protection of 7½ cents a bushel, which shows a prejudice for the breweries of about 50 to 1. Who can defend that?

The theory of the law of supply and demand is that shortage creates price. This past year, we raised about 60 percent of our needed supply of rye. Rye prices should boom up away above parity. But no, in comes the Canadian rye. Who can defend these things? What Member of the House, or the Senate, or the State Department, or the Department of Agriculture will take the facts to the public and attempt to defend them?

If these very important economic matters, affecting the economic welfare of our farmers, are serious to our farmers and costly to our farmers at a time when we have the highest employment we have ever had and the highest purchasing power we have ever had, what are these farmers to look forward to in a period of recession?

If there is to be a program to curtail wheat production next year, what are our farmers going to do with their cropland? If wheat restriction is approved, are we going

to say to them, "Shift your wheatland into oats, barley, and rye"? I simply cannot understand how any sane man with any sense would dare openly and publicly support such economic nonsense and such flagrant prejudice against our grain farmers.

Our agricultural acreage is total. Followed from the South to the North, you will find areas where cotton, grain sorghums, and wheat are interchangeable in production. As you keep on moving over the country, you will find related interchangeability of crops, so that we really are always dealing with total acreage in cropland. Therefore, as you trace feed grains from Canada, it affects grain sorghum acreage or cotton acreage in the South.

Who, in view of all facts, can stand before the public and rest a case upon shifting of crops with the implication that we have surpluses of some and shortages of others?

Even though I serve as President of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, I have no contact with Secretary Benson. I wrote him one letter, which he never answered, so I am through with him. I do enjoy contact with important Members of Congress as deeply interested in this matter of protection to American farmers as I am. But, this is of no avail, unless such Members go on the floor of the House and Senate and pound away everytime there is a chance to speak, calling attention to these serious problems.

The land of agriculture is the last segment of free America. This great family of unorganized farmers is the last group in this country that is exposed to the jungle law of supply and demand.

Efficient agriculture carried to its ultimate conclusion will rest upon the farmlands of this country in feudal ownership, resulting finally in organized farm labor on the land, which will result in two things:

1. Organized farm labor means that consumers will be buying their food and fiber on a labor wage, portal-to-portal, time and one-half, double time, vacations, social security, resulting in prices twice as high as they are at the present time.

2. With labor organized both in the urban and rural areas, there will be the final clash between organized workers and concentrated capital.

Very sincerely yours,
FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL
ASSOCIATION,
M. W. THATCHER, General Manager.

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a Consolidated General Appropriation Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is no man in the Senate for whom I hold a higher regard than the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has spearheaded many attempts to economize in Government and to attain a balanced budget. However, I am in disagreement with him—and with the 49 cosponsors of the concurrent resolution—in his statement as to what the concurrent resolution would accomplish.

As I pointed out in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], every year the President of the United States furnishes to the Congress a budget, which he must submit early in January of each year.

In that budget he states specifically the amount of money which is to be spent, or which he suggests should be spent, by each department of Government. The budget also includes an estimate of the amount of revenue which is expected to be collected during the year for which the appropriation is to be made.

In addition to the budget, which, as my colleagues are well aware, is quite voluminous, the executive department furnishes to the Congress a summary called the Federal Budget in Brief. On page 5 of the Federal Budget in Brief for the year 1954, there appears estimates of receipts for 1954 in the sum of \$68.7 billion. Estimated expenditures amount to \$78.6 billion. The budget summary also indicates the deficit which will occur if the amount of money suggested is appropriated, and the amount of receipts comes within the estimate made by the President.

Each year similar information is made available to all Members of Congress. I fail to see how money can be saved if we write into the appropriation bill the very thing which we are furnished by the President—that is, a statement of the receipts as against the expenditures.

I read from page 2 of the report on the concurrent resolution:

By terms of this concurrent resolution Congress would write into each consolidated appropriation bill, as well as supplemental and deficiency bills, annual limits on all items which propose obligations for expenditure beyond a fiscal year as well as annual limitations on all obligations for expenditure carrying over from prior fiscal years.

The importance of this may be seen from the fact that on next June 30, 1953, the buildup from unexpended balances from old appropriations and authorizations will probably meet \$100 billion. While a large part of this total may be called obligated, the validity of the whole would be reviewed annually by adoption of this resolution.

How does the concurrent resolution seek to meet this contingency? Prior to World War II there was an understanding, or custom, between the House and the Senate, whereby authority was given to each department of Government to contract in advance for such goods, wares and merchandise as it might need. This contract authority was withdrawn during World War II, and the House insisted on the procedure requiring that before a contract could be entered into by any department of Government, Congress must first appropriate the entire amount of the contract.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURCELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to point out to the Senator that while it may be true that the unexpended balance of an appropriation may be very large, 85 percent of the items in an appropriation bill are 1-year appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct, if he is referring to the number of items, rather than the amount.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am speaking about the number of items. It is proposed to

put all this information in a report, when about 85 percent of the items are 1-year appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows what is done by the Appropriations Committee with respect to some of these unexpended balances. What we do is to deduct them from the entire amount requested, and let the Department spend so much in new money, supplemented by what is carried over.

The point I wish to make is simply that, whether it be done by contract authority or by appropriating the money in advance, we cannot tell exactly how much we are to spend from year to year. We cannot hit the nail on the head, so to speak as the concurrent resolution proposes to do.

I recall very well that during 1950 we appropriated approximately \$2 billion for airplanes. Those airplanes were actually ordered in 1951. They are now being delivered in 1953. However, we appropriated the money back in 1950. The money was not spent in the first year, and I doubt if it will all be spent by the end of 1953. How we shall be able to say that during a given period so much will be spent on airplanes is beyond me. It is impossible to say. When it comes to appropriating for regular departments of Government, as was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] such appropriations are appropriations from year to year. If there is any unexpended balance, either it goes back to the Treasury or it is deducted from the cash amount asked by the Department for the succeeding year.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. It may be that prior to the end of the fiscal year one of the annual appropriations may be obligated; but it is obligated only for the succeeding fiscal year, and if not expended it goes back into the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] pointed out, under the terms of the concurrent resolution, if we contract to build an airplane carrier, it may require 4 years to construct it. What we would have to do would be to give contract authority to enter into a contract for the full price of the ship, and appropriate each year an amount sufficient to pay for the work as it progresses.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is not the proposal of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the concurrent resolution there would be authority to enter into contracts.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly. I do not know whether the House would ever agree to that or not.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that it would not. The House has fought against this repeatedly, and will not permit any department to enter into a contract. The House insists that the full amount of money be appropriated during the year the contract is entered into, whether or not the goods are delivered during that year, or whether they are delivered 2 or 3 years hence.

Mr. HAYDEN. What I could not quite understand in the statement of the Sen-

ator from Virginia was this: He stated that if all the money were appropriated, we could fix the amount to be expended each fiscal year. How can anyone guess how much is to be spent each year on the contract for a battleship?

Mr. ELLENDER. It cannot be done. That is just what I am trying to point out. So whether we follow the procedure of granting contract authority, or whether we appropriate the entire amount during the year the contract is made, we shall have the same result.

Mr. President, if the concurrent resolution is adopted and the House should unfortunately agree to it, I dare say it will be late in the fall before any appropriation bill is passed.

A one-package appropriation bill will not receive the same amount of study which separate bills receive. Under the present system our committee is divided into 10 subcommittees. Most of us serve on at least half of the subcommittees. For example, I serve on subcommittees which appropriate money for every one except three of the departments of the Government. I am able to attend most of the hearings which are held on appropriation bills for the Department of the Interior, the Army civil functions, and the Department of Agriculture, and I am more or less acquainted with what goes on in the other subcommittees. When the separate bills are reported to the full committee, the committee itself goes over the bills very carefully. After the bills are reported to the Senate, the Senate itself certainly has a better opportunity to study the items in separate appropriation bills for each department than if one bill for the 11 departments were to be presented at once.

There will be untold time lost also, Mr. President, in conference, where conferees will be forced to deal with and reconcile a multiplicity of items. I dare say that the committee will be doing extremely well to report a measure agreeable to both Houses by early fall.

There is no doubt in my mind that if any money is to be saved, we can more easily bring about that result under the present system of separate appropriation bills than by means of a one-package appropriation bill.

Let us not forget that in the various appropriations 87 percent of the money appropriated goes toward paying for past wars and protecting ourselves against future wars. \$87 out of every \$100 appropriated is for that purpose. Of the remaining 13 percent a good deal of money is spent for defense housing, aid to schools in defense areas, generation and transmission of power, atomic energy, defense plants, and other matters directly connected with our security.

No, Mr. President; the only way by which we can save money is for the Appropriation Committees of the Senate and House to make a thorough study of appropriations, and to employ sufficient help to make such a study, before the appropriation bills come before the two bodies for action.

For example, in the closing days of the 82d Congress an appropriation was requested with which to build a hospital at Fort Belvoir in Virginia. It happened

that some of us knew of the conditions at Fort Belvoir. There was a request to build a 500-bed hospital, which would have cost, I believe, \$15,000 a bed.

I had visited Fort Belvoir a few months before the request was made. I found there were 1,200 beds available at Fort Belvoir, and of the 1,200 beds only 250 were being used. Nevertheless, we had a request to build a 500-bed hospital.

What was the explanation given to us? There was no need for a 500-bed hospital, but those making the request were taking advantage of the emergency in order to obtain a permanent building for a hospital. Because some of us knew the true situation, there was stricken from the bill approximately \$48 million requested for hospitals to be built in 10 facilities scattered throughout the country.

Mr. President, if the members of the committee had sufficient help—and we are getting it now—in order to make inspections ahead of time, we could save money, and we could save more money in that manner than by way of a one-package appropriation bill. We could cut, percentage-wise, 5 or 10 percent and save the \$800 million which the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] stated was saved on the one-package bill in 1950.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe I heard my colleague say that the committee is now getting help so it can examine some of the items that should be questioned. Will the Senator explain why we are getting the help now, when we were not getting it in the past?

Mr. ELLENDER. We depended too much on the military. When the military officials came before our committee we took it for granted that everything they asked of us was in order. We took their word for it. That was a grave mistake. If in the past 10 years we had had sufficient help on the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, and if we had then had some of the experts we are now employing to go forth and look behind the scenes to find out whether the things asked for were necessary, we might have saved a great deal of money. I may say to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. My colleague from Louisiana has worked in his effort to bring about economy. It is important to achieve economy and I wonder whether he agrees with me that those who are studying requests for appropriations should not be confronted with such an enormous task, without expert assistance. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and the only way economy can be brought about is by having knowledge of the facts, circumstances, and necessities? Does the Senator agree?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I agree.

Mr. ELLENDER. The example I cited a short time ago can be duplicated many times. For instance, I remember in that same bill there was contained an item

amounting to approximately \$6 million for the construction of laundries in my State. I asked, "What did you do during World War II?"

I was told, "We had the laundries operated by private enterprise in the city of Lake Charles and in other towns near the camps, and with the one that was built at Camp Polk we were able to take care of the situation."

Notwithstanding the fact that the needs were well taken care of during the war years the officials had asked for an amount of money with which to build a brand-new laundry at the airport which was then being constructed at Lake Charles. Because we were familiar with the situation, we were able to examine the witnesses on the subject and elicit the facts.

By the same token, in order that we may be in a position to bring about some real savings, we must try to find out in advance what the money is to be spent for.

We should cut the appropriation in advance. The way to do it is first of all to determine the purpose for which it is to be used.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Some of us found, in studying requests for public works authorizations last year, that by sending out someone who was an expert in the construction field to examine the type of construction asked for, in many cases we could reduce the unit price by about 25 percent simply by requiring that the structures should not be so elaborate as they had been planned.

Mr. ELLENDER. In that connection, Mr. President, I may state to my colleague that I presume the method followed by the military in the case he has mentioned may be the same method followed with respect to the hospitals I mentioned a short time ago.

Instead of having plans to present to the committee as to how the hospitals were to be built, they simply said, "We will build in Louisiana a 500-bed hospital at a cost of \$15,000 a bed. We are going to build a hospital at Fort Belvoir, with 500 beds; and the cost will be \$15,000 a bed."

That is the way the costs were arrived at in the case of the hospitals to be built in the 10 facilities.

I have no doubt in my mind that the same process was followed in many of the cases to which my distinguished colleague is referring.

Mr. LONG. It seems that the principal thing we need is to have someone check firsthand, in the field, on many of the expenditures.

Mr. ELLENDER. And to do so before they are made.

Mr. LONG. Yes; and also to have someone who is qualified to check on those who do the work.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. President, I repeat that there is no chance to save the millions of dollars which some Senators say will be saved.

A while ago my good friend, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], said—and it seemed that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]

did not disagree with him—that the "one package" appropriation bill which was passed in 1950 resulted in the saving of billions of dollars. I wish either of those Senators would point out to us how billions of dollars were saved in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, as amended.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question before the Senate is on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, as amended.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, this resolution is a rehash of a great many ideas which have been popular with people who know nothing about the problem of appropriations as it exists in the Congress. To quote from a newspaper of national circulation:

The consolidation of all appropriations into one act, whatever the theoretical arguments in favor of it, is in actual operation a wholly impractical, unwieldy cumbersome, inefficient and unbusinesslike method of handling appropriations.

There are many similar quotations, but, without quoting them, I desire to say as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as the past chairman of a subcommittee of that committee handling appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, that I have had an opportunity to compare at first hand the two methods, the old method, and the new method now proposed, which was once tried, in 1950.

The inadequacies of the so-called one-package appropriation became glaringly obvious in 1950. In that year we spent practically the whole year trying to put together into one bill the various parts, and then endeavoring in conference to obtain agreement with the House on the bill.

I know of no way by which we could make the appropriations in a one-package bill, unless there were an executive session of the Senate and House, and all their Members, sitting jointly, each Member of the Congress, hearing the testimony of each of the witnesses who appeared before them. It would mean that there would be no transaction of legislative business other than the consideration of appropriation bills.

The Appropriations Committee has a staff composed of persons who are specially trained in the work of dealing with particular phases of appropriations. They investigate the legislative proposals, search out the mistakes that may be contained in them, and endeavor to bring such mistakes to the attention of the members of the particular subcommittee with which they are working.

They endeavor to reconcile the differences which may arise in the determination of where cuts can be made. The staff cannot deal with the entire governmental picture, which has become too vast. A larger staff, instead of being more helpful, would be found to be less efficient. The result would be that, being unable to provide for the necessities of the various departments, an effort would be made to balance the budget at all events, and in so doing, a particular agency, no matter how valuable it might be in the general picture, would suffer, since there would be no one present to speak for it.

From the days of the Founding Fathers, with the exception of one year, the Senate has worked on the plan of breaking down the requests for appropriations into the component parts. The most that can be said for that method is that only those Senators are kept off the floor who are engaged in the hearings, a great many of them working on appropriations only. The same is true in the House of Representatives, though not quite to the same extent, since the House has a larger membership, and therefore no Member of the House serves on more than one subcommittee. Under the procedure in the Senate the subcommittees, after having heard the witnesses, approve a budget and submit it, with their justification, to the full committee. Each subcommittee submits its justification to the full committee, after which the full committee submits a report to the Senate, together with its justifications. The Senate, on the basis of the two reports, then decides how much should be appropriated for each department, in accordance with the needs of the Nation.

That method, as we found in 1950, enables the Senate to work about 4 or 5 times as fast as under the other method, and it works with less injustice to the people as a whole. For that reason I was in 1950, and I still am, confirmed in my belief that the so-called one-package appropriation simply does not work. As in the case of many other things, the proposal embodies a fine ideal, and, assuming we had unlimited time, it might work out satisfactorily.

Mr. President, let me call attention to something else. Let us suppose that the authorizations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments were delayed until the passage of a one-package bill. Let us suppose that during that time, in working on the one-package bill, we made a 20-percent cut in the appropriation for the Post Office; and let us assume further that the one-package bill was not passed until October, as in 1950. In the meantime, July, August, September, and October would have gone by entailing the passage of continuing resolutions. The Post Office Department would have operated for 4 months on the basis of the appropriation for the preceding year. It would then suddenly face a 20-percent curtailment, to be taken care of within a period of 8 months. That would mean that, instead of its being a 20-percent curtailment, it would in effect be a 30-percent curtailment during the 8-month period, while an effort was being made to meet the budget.

Then, in order to maintain the postal service, we would have to pass numerous supplemental appropriations, that in my humble opinion would deceive the public, since we would say to them "Oh, yes, we appropriated only X billions of dollars this year," but later on we would make supplemental appropriations of Y billions of dollars.

The one-package appropriation bill would lead to that result every year, since, if it were necessary to wait for the passage of the one-package appropriation bill, numerous supplemental appropriations would be required. Even though, by curtailment of expenses, a department could get along for a while with the appropriations previously made, it would have to carry on into October, until the one-package bill could be passed. It simply would not work.

So, Mr. President, quoting from another national publication—

The one-package approach provides a far less adequate way of determining the real needs of the departments and agencies of the Government, and makes the achievement of proper economies in governmental operations correspondingly difficult.

Mr. President, another suggestion has been made in connection with this matter. It has been suggested that the President might veto a one-package bill unless there was incorporated a provision permitting him to veto individual items.

Mr. President, that is another thing which we should consider very carefully. We must realize that that is the first step toward totalitarianism. We would be creating a superappropriations committee composed of one man. If anyone thinks that appropriations do not make government, that person is badly fooled. By striking out certain items agencies can be discriminated against; markets can be hurt; services can be curtailed. Congress would be relinquishing one of its most powerful assets if such an amendment to this concurrent resolution should be adopted. I am speaking to it, even though such an amendment may not be offered. I think it would be the most dangerous precedent we could establish. We might just as well abolish Congress and start out on a completely totalitarian basis.

I do not want anyone to infer that I am saying President Eisenhower would use the veto power wrongly, any more than I would say that Truman, Roosevelt, Hoover, or any other President in the past 20 or 30 years would have used it wrongly. But there may come a time when some President will use it wrongly, and that is what Congress must protect against. We must realize that when Congress ceases to function representative government ceases. The Members of this body know the conditions in their own States better than does any one man in the entire United States, just as a Member of the House of Representatives knows conditions in his district better than does anyone else. Therefore, Mr. President, it is entirely essential that we permit no such amendment to be adopted.

In 1950 when the one-package bill idea was followed I think we did get home in time to decorate the Christmas tree and

have the grandchildren in. Unless we expect such situations as that in the future it is dangerous to follow this one-package idea of an appropriation bill.

I do not know how many members of the Appropriations Committee concur with me in this statement. Last year I was able to beat the deadline on the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill by working very hard, so that those agencies did not have any difficulty during the fiscal year in knowing how to balance their budgets to meet the appropriations and save many supplemental appropriation bills. That cannot be done with a one-package appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I hope the lessons which were painfully learned through our experience with the one-package approach will not be forgotten. Those Senators who were not Members of the Senate in that unfortunate year do not know that we battled all over the floor of the Senate. The Appropriations Committee battled for weeks. The only thing we can do is to hold up appropriations until the last one is taken care of, then bring the bill to the floor, then go into conference, which will last 5 or 6 times as long as they last on appropriation bills under our present system, and we shall finally have to shut our eyes and hope for the best in order to get any money for the departments without their having to run into the red.

Mr. President, I hope the resolution and any amendments thereto will be defeated.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if there is any plea which I should like to make to the Senate, it is that it refuse to impose upon us a bulky, unworkable, impracticable appropriation bill such as we had in 1950.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. How long has the Senator from Arizona been a member of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Too long. I have been a member of it since 1927.

In 1950 the bill passed the House on May 10. It was reported to the Senate on July 8. We had approximately 2 months to work on it in the committee, and the bill passed the Senate on the 4th of August. It was in conference for a month, and finally became law on the 6th of September 1950.

If the House of Representatives wants to control appropriations, all it has to do is to take its time about passing a one-package appropriation bill because the Senate will not have time, in the heat of the summer and late in the session, to consider and work out the details of the bill as they should be considered and perfected.

Mr. President, the 1950 appropriation bill as reported to the Senate consisted of 482 pages. It weighed more than a pound and a half. The Senate committee's report contained 303 pages. Senators simply could not digest such a voluminous report.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have the bill before me, and it consists of only 192 pages.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has the law print of the bill. He does not have before him the bill as it was reported to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. I have the bill which was signed by the President.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly; but it is in much smaller type than was the bill which the Senators considered on the floor.

Mr. President, the House Committee on Appropriations consists of 50 members. It is an exclusive committee. The members of it serve on no other committee. The subcommittees consist of five members each. Each one of the subcommittees considers appropriations for a department or a group of departments. They naturally become experts on a particular department, such as the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior. They defend the bill on the floor of the House and act as conferees when it goes to conference. They take the budget items as submitted by the President, and each one has to be completely justified by the subcommittees. So they know what is in the bill, and they handle it properly.

What about the Senate, Mr. President? We have 23 members of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Each one of us belongs to four different subcommittees. A Senator cannot be in four places at once. Many times several hearings are going on at once. The time of the Senators is not completely available for the business of the committee and its subcommittee at all times, because those who are members of that one committee are also members of at least one other committee, and some of them are members of more than one other committee.

The chairman of the committee is President pro tempore of the Senate and is also a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Four Senators are chairmen of other committees. Seven are ranking minority members of standing committees. There are 3 who have membership on 2 other committees, and 8 who are members of legislative committees of the Senate.

I do not think that situation could be better described than it was on one occasion by former Senator McKellar, when he said:

While the wide scope of this representation of the business of the Senate is of the utmost value to the committee in its work, the time consumed by their duties on legislative committees serves to greatly shorten the time available to Members for attending hearings and considering and deciding upon individual items of appropriations. While an appropriation bill is passing through the procedure from subcommittee to full committee to floor consideration and adjusting differences in the conference committee with the House, there is constant conflict in the times and dates set for the various meetings required. In addition, since each member of the committee is a member of 4 or 5 subcommittees, Senators can never find the time necessary to spread their attendance over all of the meetings it is necessary to schedule.

There may be a valuable suggestion in the remarks made by the Senator

from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] this afternoon. Perhaps we should make the Appropriations Committee an exclusive committee, so that Senators who serve on it would have no other duties. But, as it is, we manage to get appropriation bills through in reasonable time under ordinary conditions, because the House begins to send them to the Senate early in the year, and staggers them along.

Mr. President, I have made these remarks because I am impressed with the fact that many Senators support the kind of proposal now made because their State legislatures act upon one-package appropriation bills. I made inquiry of the Senator from New York with reference to the budget of that State, and I have been advised that it is about \$1,400,000,000. According to a statement which I shall read, the budget of the State of California is about a billion dollars.

I wish to quote from a very able article written by Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, who was for 12 years a member of the California Legislature and who has been for 10 years a Member of Congress, the last 7 years helping to prepare appropriation bills. He is now chairman of the subcommittee handling the independent offices appropriation bill. Mr. PHILLIPS says:

In a private business, where projected expenditures are calculated in relatively small figures, a consolidated budget is eminently practical. In a State legislature also the plan is practical. To infer from the experience of private companies and State legislatures that the plan can automatically be taken over by the Federal Government is to overlook the tremendous difference that results when one moves from relatively small sums to sums which are so colossal that they literally defy anyone to analyze them intensively in a single operation. In my own State of California, for example, where the package budget is used, the total cost of State government is just a little over \$1 billion. This is only one-sixth of the money involved in the independent offices appropriation bill alone, and a much smaller fraction of total Federal appropriations.

The independent offices appropriation bill is the one which Representative PHILLIPS' subcommittee handles, as I have said.

Once an omnibus bill begins to deal with sums so many times larger than a State budget, the operation necessarily becomes so bulky as to impede careful consideration.

That has been our experience in the Senate. Mr. PHILLIPS points out another aspect of the matter which I think is very significant and is exactly in line with what happened when the Senate had before it the last package appropriation bill. A percentage cut was offered as an amendment. That is a temptation which is very hard for Senators to resist. I wish to read Mr. PHILLIPS' comment on that method of trying to reduce appropriations, a method I have protested vigorously, because I believe that thereby we surrender our judgment to the judgment of someone in a department as to where reductions in appropriations ought to be made. Mr. PHILLIPS says:

The package budget inevitably invites amendments directing the President to cut the total amount by a given sum or per-

centage. In fact, one of the greatest boasts of the package-budget advocates is that the experiment on the fiscal year 1951 bill facilitated the amendment which directed the President to cut the final total by an amount approximating \$550 million.

I understood the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to say that it was \$800 million.

In principle this approach represents an abdication of congressional responsibility over the power of the purse. From the viewpoint of practical politics it confers upon the President the power to penalize his political opponents by eliminating expenditures in their home districts. Any President of the United States who wanted to achieve dictatorial control over Congress could ask for little more than the restoration of the package budget and the inevitable move to amend it every year by directing him to make a cut of a given size in any manner he chooses. All he would need before him would be a list of major budget items, a list of the doubtful districts and States, a telephone at his elbow, a blue pencil in his hand, and a skillful publicity man to explain why Senator X and Representative Y were the obstacles to a new highway or dam.

It is an ironic paradox that Members of Congress who shudder at the thought of a constitutional amendment allowing a President to veto individual items in a bill have supported an extra-constitutional device which in effect gives the President the same veto power but allows the Congress no opportunity to override him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Arizona think that the argument of Mr. Phillips would apply to an item veto, as has been suggested sometimes, rather than to such a bill as would come before the Senate under the concurrent resolution of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]? In most of the items, or in a large part of them, we are dealing with total figures. For instance, even in the civil functions bill, we are dealing with a total figure. The President would not be in a position to act and strike out language from the committee report. If a blanket cut were applied, it would apply to the total within the various titles of the bill.

I think the argument of the Member of the House from my State, with whom I served in the legislature some 20 years ago, would be quite applicable if we tried, which I doubt we could do constitutionally, to provide for an item veto, as some States provide in their constitutions.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator must concede that when we tell the President to reduce an appropriation bill by \$550 million, he can make the reduction anywhere he pleases. To make the cut, he must take it out of items; he cannot take it out of the total.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think he could take it out of the total. I think there might be some instances which would affect only an area, but normally that is not the procedure. A certain amount is allotted for a specific purpose, but that purpose is broader than a single State or a single area of the country. So I believe that under the bill it would be difficult for the President, even if he were so inclined, to use the type of item

veto which Representative PHILLIPS seems to be talking about.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think an item-veto provision would give the President much more power than does this resolution, but the point I am making is that we surrender power whenever we provide for a percentage cut. I think Mr. PHILLIPS was perfectly justified in the approach he took.

I pass on to another matter which seems to be confusing. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] mentioned it. It does not seem to be understood that the President's budget, as submitted, shows all the items the Senator from Virginia insists should be placed in a committee report. It shows the amount of money expended during the previous year. It shows the amount estimated to be needed. It shows the unexpended balances. On every subcommittee on which I have served—and I know this is equally true in the other House—every Member is keen to know what the unexpended balances are and to examine into them.

As I have pointed out today, if we were required to set forth in some kind of committee report all the things required by the terms of this resolution, a 20-column chart would be required. Furthermore, the chart would have to be revised when the House subcommittee made its report to the full committee, when the full committee made its report to the House of Representatives, and again after the House had acted. It would then have to be revised by the Senate subcommittee, next by the full committee, later revised when it came to the floor of the Senate, and finally when the bill was taken to conference.

What Senator will take the time to analyze a 20-column chart that has been revised 7 times, when all the basic information upon which action is to be taken can be found in the budget? I cannot see any advantage that could possibly accrue from a situation of that kind.

In conclusion, I point out that the Director of the Budget and his predecessor have both stated that a consolidated appropriation bill of the type proposed would not be satisfactory to them, speaking for the administration, unless it contained a provision for an item veto.

Mr. Dodge says:

One problem which does concern me is the likelihood that omnibus appropriation bills would contain legislative riders, and in some cases would contain appropriation items which the President considered too high. Under the late schedule—

He is referring to the fact that the bill would not become a law until very late, when Congress was about ready to adjourn—

Under the late schedule that would be apt to prevail, the veto of an omnibus appropriation bill would disrupt the operations of the Government during the intervening period until Congress passed a new bill or passed the old one over the veto of the President. I believe, therefore, that the President should be given the item veto power concurrently with the adoption of an omnibus appropriation bill.

He is eminently correct. If we are to have a one-package bill, and if we are

to allow to be incorporated into it legislation to which the President is violently opposed and which he would veto instantly if he had the opportunity, he should also have the item veto power.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Has an appropriation bill ever been vetoed?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BYRD. A total appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was never more than one omnibus appropriation bill. However, annual appropriation bills have been vetoed.

Mr. BYRD. I have been in the Senate for 21 years, and I have never known of a case.

Mr. HAYDEN. President Roosevelt vetoed one, and I am quite sure one was vetoed by President Truman.

Mr. BYRD. It might have been a special bill, but not one of the 12 regular departmental appropriation bills.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am quite sure that the RECORD will show that such bills have been vetoed.

Presidents during modern times have become more accustomed to using the veto. President Cleveland vetoed about 400 bills, and President Franklin Roosevelt vetoed about twice that number. Appropriation bills can be vetoed without any difficulty if the President wishes to do it. The point I am trying to make is that a President is practically helpless because if he should veto a bill of that kind, regardless of how violently he is opposed to the legislation contained in it, or how much he may be opposed to items contained in it, it would come back to the Congress and be wide open to amendment.

On the other hand, the only way Congress could stymie the President would be to pass such a bill and adjourn immediately. Even if the President possessed the item veto power, the Congress could do that. If we are to have the one-package bill, I think there is justification for the Presidential item veto power, on the basis set forth by Mr. Dodge. I am not for the one-package bill, and therefore I do not have to be for the Presidential item veto power.

If we are to try out the proposed system, as was suggested by an amendment which is pending before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, a rider can be attached to any one of the appropriation bills providing that the House and the Senate agree that individual items contained in such bill may be vetoed. I do not know how the question could ever get into court, because no one could complain. No one could show cause why the action was not legal.

It is my opinion, to get back to the beginning of what I said, that a one-package bill is a cumbersome way of handling appropriations. It would be burdensome upon members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and burdensome upon Members of the Senate when the bill reached the floor of the Senate. I believe it would be so burdensome that we would not get as good results in the way of economy as we would under the present system. That is my

honest, deliberate judgment. For that reason I am opposed to the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution as amended.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the 83d Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act of (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriations bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure as of the beginning of the fiscal year, other than the obligated balances of expired appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from the balances of appropriations and other budgetary au-

thorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (B);

"(E) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from revolving and management funds, other than expenditures referred to in clauses (C) and (D);

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on revolving and management funds (including the funds of wholly-owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate contain in the body of the bill or in a preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement respecting Senate Concurrent Resolution 8.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, most frequently is referred to as the single appropriation bill, or the single-package bill.

But this reference does not—it never has—accurately describe its provisions.

Actually the bill is in three principal parts:

The first part does provide for a single bill in which all general appropriations shall be considered by Congress with one cover. And this is as far as the so-called single appropriation bill of 1950 went.

The second part provides that Congress shall write into appropriation bills limitations against annual obligations against all available appropriations both current, and those previously enacted; and to my mind this provision, which has been in the bill since it was first introduced in 1947, is the most important.

The third part provides that as the bill passes through the various stages of the leg-

islative process, it shall set forth revised estimates of the revenue.

Frankly, Congress virtually has lost annual control over expenditures from the Federal Treasury, and the purpose of this bill is to recover legislative control, at least in part.

There are numerous practices which have grown up to contribute to this loss of control. They include permanent appropriations; adoption of statutory programs requiring Federal payments to meet formula fixed in the law; authorization to spend from the public debt, etc. For all practical purposes these expenditures are beyond annual review by the appropriations committees, and annual control by Congress.

But by far the most important of these practices, which deprive Congress of annual control over expenditures, is the practice of "funding" entirely—or appropriating the full amount in advance—multi-year programs and projects requiring multi-million- or multi-billion-dollar appropriations.

As the result of this practice we have piled up more than \$102 billion of balances in authorizations to spend out of the Treasury. These balances are in appropriations already passed—in prior years. They include more than \$80 billion in regular and special funds, and more than \$20 billion in revolving and capital funds. And, it should be emphasized that all appropriations enacted by the present session of Congress will be in addition to this \$100 billion to be available for expenditure next July 1.

As members of this committee know—under current appropriation legislation procedure, Congress acts only on new appropriations. Under ordinary procedure neither the Appropriations Committees nor the Congress as a whole, would act this year to review or control expenditures to be made from these huge balances. Yet, these balances are just as available for expenditure in the coming year as will be the funds provided in the appropriation bills now before us. And expenditures from these balances will result in just as much deficit as expenditures from new appropriations.

Actually under the Truman budget submitted to Congress January 9, \$38 billion of next year's estimated expenditures would be out of balances in appropriations enacted in prior years over which this Congress would have no control—it would not even review them in any substantial degree.

By the same token \$32 billion of new appropriations requested in the Truman budget would be for expenditure, not in the coming year, but in some future year.

From these figures it can be seen that an appropriation enacted in a year when revenue is high, may actually be expended in a year when revenue is low.

This is not responsible practice when the Federal debt is already more than a quarter of a trillion dollars—when the necessity for raising the debt ceiling is becoming more evident every day—and when the probability of a debt in excess of \$300 billion can be reversed only by forthright action.

I do not concede that Federal expenditures cannot be reduced. I do not concede that deficit spending must be continued. I do not concede that more debt must be piled up.

But these conditions are virtually reality if Congress acquiesces in default. The fact is that the budget for fiscal year 1954 cannot be balanced by action on new appropriations. And I submit that the budget a year hence will be impossible of balance by reduction only in new appropriations.

This is to say that the Federal budget cannot be balanced in the foreseeable future unless control over annual expenditures is recaptured.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 is proposed by 50 members of the Senate as a constructive step toward this objective.

ANALYSIS OF BILL

Amendment to rules

Analysis of the resolution will reveal that, as in the past, the proposal is in the nature of an amendment to the joint rule of the Senate and the House of Representatives relating to the legislative budget. (If the rules of the two Houses were amended to require the proposed procedure, it could not be abandoned by more committee action. It could be repealed only by resolution approved by both Houses.)

Single package

The resolution would require the consolidation of all regular appropriations into a single general appropriation bill.

Under terms of the resolution the consolidated appropriation bill might be divided into any number of separate titles, and if desired each of these titles might correspond to one of the numerous appropriation bills enacted under present procedures.

It would permit consideration of the consolidated bill by titles, at the subcommittee stage, without interruption of the present subcommittee organization of the respective appropriations committees, if that is desired.

Deficiency and supplemental bills

There would be nothing in the resolution to preclude necessary deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills in addition to the consolidated bill, but a reduction in the number of such bills probably would result. Private act appropriation bills and appropriation rescission bills also would be permissible.

Limitations

The resolution would require that Congress write into the consolidated bill limitations on the net amounts to be obligated during the ensuing year against all new multi-year appropriations. Likewise limitations would be written into the bill on the net obligations to be made during the year against appropriations enacted in prior years which were still available for obligation.

Contracts

These limitations would not prohibit Government agencies from entering into authorized contracts, but they would control the value of goods and services to be delivered and rendered during the fiscal year.

Exclusions

In the interest of administrative efficiency and precluding unnecessary bookkeeping, the provisions limiting obligations would not apply to: appropriations made specifically for payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General; to appropriations for payment of judgments; amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress; appropriations for payment of interest on the public debt; or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

Committee reports

Under the resolution both committee reports, and conference reports, accompanying each consolidated appropriation bill would show in tabular form the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in each fiscal year under permanent appropriations; estimates of amounts to be transferred between appropriations; estimates of the net amount to be expended during the fiscal year from each appropriation, and from the balances of prior appropriations; and estimates of the amount remaining in the appropriation for expenditure in subsequent fiscal years.

Committee and conference reports accompanying deficiency and supplemental bills and appropriation rescission bills would be required to include cumulative revisions of this table.

Government corporations

With respect to Government corporations and other agencies authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering them into the Treasury, committee reports on the consolidated bill would estimate expenditures out of their checking accounts (except those to retire borrowing), and estimate their receipts (except from borrowing) to be deposited in checking accounts.

Joint hearings

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees would be authorized to hold simultaneous or joint hearings on general appropriation bills in order to expedite their consideration.

Revenue estimates

And finally, to assure that expenditure authorizations are being considered at all times in the light of the latest revenue estimates, the resolution provides that the current revenue estimates by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be written into each general, deficiency, or supplemental bill as it is reported by the respective committees to the House and to the Senate.

In summary, provisions of the resolution would provide that Congress consider all appropriations in one package, instead of a dozen scattered, unrelated bills as at present, so Members and the public can see the whole picture as the spending side of the budget develops. (The so-called single appropriation bill of 1950 merely collected all of the regular appropriation bills between two covers. It did no more.)

This resolution would go further, and provide that Congress shall write into the appropriation bill, against all items involved, limitations on annual obligations for expenditure from all appropriations—those previously enacted as well as those currently under consideration. (It should be noted that it is annual expenditures, not annual appropriations, against annual revenue which result in annual deficits or surpluses, and that it is annual deficits which pile up long-term public debt.)

And, in addition, the resolution would provide that appropriation bills themselves shall establish a relationship and comparison between funds authorized for expenditure and estimated receipts.

Analysis of the resolution will indicate clearly the care with which its provisions have been worked out and drafted. For obvious reasons officials of the General Accounting Office, Treasury and Bureau of the Budget may not wish to endorse or oppose a proposal amending legislative branch rules, but they have testified that it is technically perfected, and that it is administratively practical in terms of accounting and auditing practices and fiscal and budgetary requirements.

Substantially as it is now the resolution has been introduced in the Senate in each of the past three Congresses.

It was first introduced in 1947. Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, cosponsored it with me at that time. The Senate Rules and Administration Committee of the Republican 80th Congress held exhaustive hearings and gave the resolution its approval without a dissenting vote, but it died on the calendar when the session expired before action was taken by the Senate as a whole.

The resolution was reintroduced again in 1949. This time, besides myself, it was sponsored by Senator BRIDGES, BUTLER of Nebraska, FERGUSON, GILLETTE, KNOWLAND, O'CONNOR, and the late Senator WHERRY. Again, the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, of the Democratic 81st Congress held exhaustive hearings and gave the resolution its approval without dissenting vote. This time the Senate, as a whole, passed it without a

dissenting vote. But the House of Representatives failed to act before the session expired, and the resolution died again.

Once more the resolution was introduced in 1951 early in the 82d Congress. This time—as now—more than half the membership of the Senate joined in its sponsorship. Once more the Senate Rules and Administration Committee held exhaustive hearings, and this time the committee reported the bill favorably with only one dissenting vote. This was by Senator HAYDEN who expressed his opposition in Individual Views which were included in the committee report. The report was delayed until late spring last year—too late for action in the Senate.

So the bill was introduced again on February 4, this year—this time with more sponsors than ever before—51 at the last count.

Most of the opposition expressed by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman of the past session set forth in Senator HAYDEN's "Individual Views" last year was based on what they said was their experience with the omnibus bill of the 2d session of the 81st Congress. They said it overworked the membership of the Appropriations Committee, and slowed down passage of appropriations.

There is little similarity between the omnibus bill of 1950 and the procedure proposed in this resolution. There is a vast difference between the two.

The omnibus bill as it was drafted by House Appropriations Committee in the 81st Congress merely dumped all of the regular appropriations into one bill. There was no provision for either control or limitation of annual obligations. And there was no provision for expenditure estimates. There was no authorization for relating latest revenue estimates to appropriation action.

This House Appropriations Committee version of the bill was abandoned by the committee, over the protest of its chairman, after a trial of only 1 year, and that was a year in which huge supplemental appropriations were required incident to the sudden outbreak of unexpected war. The committee action was final since the House had failed to pass this resolution which would have amended the rules.

As to overworking the membership of the committee, I can say only that nothing on earth is now more important than the fiscal condition of this Nation.

As to slowing down passage of appropriations, I can document the statement that by the record more members of both Houses of Congress participated in the debate on that omnibus bill than took part in the debates on the numerous appropriation bills passed in the years immediately before and immediately after the omnibus bill trial.

By the same record the actual working time on the floors of the two Houses was shown to have been less on the omnibus bill than it was on the numerous bills in the years immediately before and after the omnibus-bill trial.

There are legitimate criticisms of the proposal now before this committee, but they can be answered, and the sponsors believe they are both outweighed and outnumbered by the advantages.

The three major criticisms of the proposal which have been considered by both the sponsors and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration on 3 different occasions over a period of nearly 6 years are:

1. Length of time required by the Appropriations Committee and the respective Houses in consideration of a consolidated bill.

2. Necessity for the President to veto a bill containing all appropriations in the event he disapproved one or more items.

3. Tendency to increase logrolling.

With respect to the first point: Both the majority of the committee and the sponsors

have taken the position that with proper cooperation between the two Houses and their respective committees, the time requirement should be met. This might well contemplate simultaneous or joint hearings, prior to passage of the bill in the House of Representatives, for detailed information purposes and justifications.

The majority of the committee, in the past, and the sponsors have taken the position that logrolling would be no greater than at present. Now Members interested in an appropriation item protest reductions in one bill because reductions are not made in others. With a consolidated bill, the tendency to logroll actually should be reduced, because the total appropriation may be calculated at one time and seen in view of estimated revenue.

Offsetting whatever legitimate criticism there may be, there are many advantages. Among them are:

1. It would bring together in one place at one time the expenditure and appropriation program of the Federal Government so that all items could be considered in their relative importance to each other. This is impossible under the present system wherein appropriation and spending legislation is considered in numerous and almost unrelated appropriation bills brought in over a period of 6 months or so.

2. It would extend legislative control over annual obligations for expenditure.

3. It would give Congress and the country a chance to see the whole spending program of the Federal Government at one time, and it would give the Appropriations Committees a chance to see and study the same thing.

4. It would give the Appropriations Committees, the revenue committees, and the country a chance to see how the spending program compares with the tax program.

The advantages of enactment of Federal appropriations under procedures proposed in this resolution were recognized by the late Harold Smith, former Director of the Budget. They have been recognized by a Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and a Republican chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. They have been recognized by numerous authorities on political science and public fiscal and budgetary practices. In addition to these eminent authorities the advantages of a single appropriation bill are recognized in testimonials from governors of a majority of the 48 States which are a part of the record already made by this committee.

If the proof is in the pudding, we have the example of the omnibus bill, such as it was. That bill was reduced by a half billion dollars on one of the most carefully worked-out appropriation-reduction amendments in recent years. There was nothing meat ax about it.

CONCLUSION

I am firmly convinced that this resolution would be a long step in the direction of recovering expenditure control by Congress, where it ought to be.

It is not the substitute for all that needs to be done in the modernization of congressional procedure on fiscal legislation, but it certainly is a vitally needed reform.

In conclusion, I should like to point out, for the record, that our Federal programs, through which Federal taxes are spent, influence policies determined in world capitals around the globe; and at the same time they influence action in every county seat of the United States. They influence the destiny of nations, and the lives of individuals.

No single thing on earth is as economically important to as many people as is the fiscal situation of this Government. Yet we are financing these programs under legislative processes in which it is impossible to know whether income and outgo are in balance.

If the American Congress and public had an opportunity to analyze fiscal legislation—along with its causes and effects—during the course of its enactment, I believe the results would be wholesome, and that there would be a measurable reduction in nonessential Federal expenditures. Such an opportunity could be provided by this simple change in the system under which Federal fiscal legislation is considered.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 100, which is a resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. I do not intend that the Senate shall proceed with the consideration of the resolution tonight, but I wish to have it made the unfinished business for tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 100) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, reported adversely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, Senate Resolution 100, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 transmitted to Congress by the President on March 25, 1953.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and because a number of Senators have inquired as to what the program is to be for the remainder of the week, I understand that probably all of tomorrow will be occupied by the consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 2, relating to the Department of Agriculture.

It is thought possible that the doctors' draft bill may be reported from the Committee on Armed Services tomorrow. If it is, it is anticipated that it may be taken up for consideration on Thursday. If not, some other measure will be taken up on Thursday.

It is the proposal of the acting majority leader that when the Senate concludes its business on Thursday afternoon, it stand in recess until Monday next.

It is expected that the Appropriations Committee will report the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill, possibly tomorrow. I am not certain that that will be the case. In any event, it will not be taken up this week, but will be ready for consideration on Monday of next week.

ADMIRAL FECHTELER, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ALLIED FORCES, SOUTHERN EUROPE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is welcome news that Admiral Fecteler will assume the duties of Commander

in Chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe. That post has been ably filled by Admiral Carney, who has been nominated to be Chief of Naval Operations.

The high qualities of both men are being given special effect in these new assignments. The fact that Admiral Fechteler was accepted by the 13 member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to relieve Admiral Carney is strong evidence of his qualities as a naval leader.

With so many of our citizens in the Armed Forces today, and so much of our national effort engaged all over the world, I am satisfied that the traditions of superior leadership, for which our Navy is justly famed, will be furthered by Admiral Fechteler in his new international assignment abroad.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 26 (legislative day of May 21), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria, and to be also United States High Commissioner for Austria, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Harold Shantz, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 26 (legislative day of May 21), 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Frederick M. Alger, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belgium.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Edward T. Walles, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

MUTUAL DEFENSE

Walter S. DeLany, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Administrator of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, pursuant to section 406 (e) of Public Law 329 81st Congress, and as authorized by section 501 (d) of Public Law 165, 82d Congress.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Herbert D. Vogel, Corps of Engineers, to be a member, Mississippi River Commission, a position to which he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Burton Coffman, minister, Church of Christ, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou art He before whom the generations of men rise and fade away. From everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. From Thee comes every good and perfect gift. To Thee, we lift our hearts in thanksgiving. Of Thee, we pray forgiveness of our sins.

O God, bless the President of the United States, the Members of Congress, and the judiciary. Bless these servants of the people that they may have wisdom to know what is right, courage to do what is right, and sufficient support of their constituents to sustain them in what is right. Endow these Thy servants with grace and knowledge to the end that the wounds of our bleeding world may be healed and peace on earth prevail. May Thy name be glorified and Thy kingdom be increased throughout all nations. God bless the United States of America and this House of Representatives. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the nationwide hue and cry about the administration's proposed reduction in the budget of the Air Force is "much ado about nothing." Here are the facts:

First. As of June 30 this year there will be an unexpended balance in our military procurement funds—appropriated last year but not spent as yet—of \$45.6 billion, of which \$26.8 billion represent outstanding orders for aircraft not yet constructed or delivered. That means 60 percent of the unexpended military appropriations of last year is for aircraft.

Second. More than 40 percent of all military appropriations for next year will be for aircraft, even with the reduced aircraft budget.

Third. The proposed reduction in the budget for the Air Force does not mean a reduction in our airpower. More than one-half of the Navy budget is for naval airpower. In fact, about 60 percent of the entire Eisenhower budget for national defense next year will be for airpower and air defense.

In the field of military planning, at least, President Eisenhower is at home and is a topnotch authority.

H. R. 5246, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that before this appropriation bill is enacted into law a provision will be inserted granting some authority to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to transfer funds, especially those funds provided for the Secretary's office. The Appropriations Committee of the other body should call upon the Secretary and General Counsel of the Department to present their views in this matter. Should the other body so amend this measure, it ought to be accepted by the House.

It is evident that in the past the Congress has indicated mistrust of the Federal Security Agency. That agency did spend money and did engage in propaganda activities not authorized by law. The situation is now changed and in the interests of sound administration it is necessary that certain reorganization take place. To do this the Secretary must have the authority to transfer funds. I might call attention to the fact that the budget for the Department was made up before Reorganization Plan No. 1 became effective.

If the Congress wants sound economical administration of our laws, we must give honest and dependable heads of departments the authority to make the best possible use of the funds appropriated.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5246) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.